



AD 9335. No 203

PS 1-8



GIVEN BY

---



110



*See back* *pt 1-2*  
INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE  
NEW YORK CITY AREA—Part 1

---

HEARINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

---

MAY 4, 1953

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities  
INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1953

pts. 1-8

## COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

### UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

RAFAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

# C O N T E N T S

---

May 4, 1953:

Testimony of—

Artie Shaw-----	Page 1150
Dorothy K. Funn-----	1195



The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, \* \* \**

## PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### RULE X

#### SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

### RULE XI

#### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

# RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

\* \* \* \* \*

## RULE X

### STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, following standing committees:

\* \* \* \* \*

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

\* \* \* \* \*

## RULE XI

### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

# INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA—PART 1

---

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*New York, N. Y.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:42 a. m., in room 1105 of the United States courthouse, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; Earl L. Fuoss, W. Jackson Jones, George C. Williams, and Alvin Stokes, investigators; Delores Anderson and Thelma Searce, staff representatives; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show that present are Mr. Kearney, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, a quorum of the full committee.

Before beginning with our hearings, I would like to make this announcement for the public and for the press:

This morning the House Committee on Un-American Activities is commencing hearings in New York City which will be continued through Friday and possibly Saturday of this week.

The committee is operating in accordance with the directions of the House of Representatives, which has charged this committee with the responsibility of investigating subversive influences and recommending legislation to safeguard the national security.

During these hearings the committee hopes to obtain valuable information relative to the extent and success of subversive influence in the field of entertainment and education and efforts to infiltrate the Government of the United States.

We are proud to welcome those of you who have taken the time to personally attend these meetings. I wish it understood, however, that in order to insure an orderly hearing, no outbursts or demonstrations of any nature will be tolerated.

The committee, as previously announced, is making these hearings available to the public in the New York area through the medium of television and otherwise. This is being done in accordance with the resolution adopted by the committee at the time of its organiza-

tional meeting, at which time the committee unanimously decided that its hearings would be available to television provided that the hearings were not sponsored and were presented on the basis of a public service.

I wish to extend the committee's thanks to the Federal and city agencies which have furnished such wholehearted cooperation to the committee in the course of the preparation of these hearings.

Mr. Counsel, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, we would like to call one witness out of the prearranged schedule. This is a witness who deals with the entertainment field, where the others following will deal with the educational field. The purpose of calling the witness at this time is in order to accommodate him in his itinerary.

I would like to call Mr. Artie Shaw.

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand?

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SHAW. So help me God, I do.

#### TESTIMONY OF ARTIE SHAW, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ANDREW D. WEINBERGER

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. SHAW. Artie Shaw.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. SHAW. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. WEINBERGER. Andrew D. Weinberger, 369 Lexington Avenue, New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Shaw?

Mr. SHAW. New York City, May 23, 1910.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. SHAW. Music and writing—both.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. SHAW. At Pine Plains, N. Y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. SHAW. Actually very little formal education. I left high school in my second year to go out into the world as a musician, and subsequently have taken a number of extension courses at Columbia, among other places—Columbia University of this city, among other places—and studied music from time to time with various people—composers, so on—and academically I've had practically no education.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, a brief background of your experience in the field of music and in the field of writing?

Mr. SHAW. Well, the field of writing can be summed up very quickly. I've written one book and had it published. I have another book ready for publication now, which is in its editing stage and probably will be published this fall.

That is my experience in the field of writing.

In the field of music, I have been playing as a professional musician since I was 14. Actually, at the age of 15 I became a professional.



That was when I started getting paid for it. I am self-taught in that sense.

I worked around the country with various orchestras until I was 19, at which time I came back to New York City.

I had, by the way, started playing music in New Haven, where I was raised, because my folks left New York when I was 7 or so. I was raised in New Haven, and took up music there.

At the age of 19 I came back to New York City, after various vicissitudes in the field. It was kind of difficult to get any employment at that time, and I went to work in one of the radio stations.

Shortly after that, I became a free-lance musician and quit the music business at about the age of 23, and I then tried to write. At that point I was then taking—

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date; what was the year, approximately?

Mr. SHAW. Well, when I was 23, it was 1933.

I went off to a so-called farm at that time—a little place in the country in Pennsylvania—and I spent a year there trying to learn more about this craft of writing, and found at the end of the year I knew very little about it—little more than when I started.

I then came back into the music business, decided to take more courses, learn more about what I wanted to learn, and use music to support myself.

Along the line there, I might say I have written all this in the first book—written about all this in the first book, which is—I don't know that I have said, but it is sort of an autobiographical work.

I then went into the band business, which is quite different from the music business in the sense of playing music for the public directly rather than for an employer.

I started my own organization—my own musical organization—I think in 1935 or 1936, traveled around the country for about 3 or 4 years, all this time getting the orchestra whipped into shape and making an organization out of it, and around 1938, I had my first national success. It came in the form of a hit record, which I made at that time—and I'm not going to advertise my own recordings here. So, there's no point in going into that kind of details.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think the committee would like to know what have been your chief productions—

Mr. SHAW. Well—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Those that you consider among the top of your work.

Mr. SHAW. Well, in 1938, on the basis of a record called *Begin the Beguine*, I first came into national prominence as an orchestra leader. At that time my salary shot way up almost overnight, and that is the criterion for success in any mass business.

And I have had orchestras on and off ever since 1938, up until 1942.

In 1941—December 7, on Pearl Harbor Day, to be precise—I was playing in a theater in Providence, R. I., and the news of Pearl Harbor came over the radio right in the wings while we were on the stage. I had stepped out of the wings for a smoke for a moment or two and, after hearing that, having to go back on the stage seemed pretty stupid at that time, in view of what was happening. The theater was filled with servicemen, and I had to go out and make an

announcement that all servicemen were to return to their bases immediately, which I did, and I turned to my band and said, "You boys better start looking for jobs," and by the first of the year I had canceled out all my engagements and went down and enlisted in the Navy.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you in the Navy?

Mr. SHAW. Well, up until 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. On your return from the Navy, in what business did you engage?

Mr. SHAW. Well, actually the business didn't change very much from what I did in the Navy. In the Navy, after several months, I went down to Washington. I enlisted as an apprentice seaman. They made me a seaman first. I went down to Washington to see Mr. Forrestal, who was then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, to ask him—actually, I did that before I joined the Navy at all—I asked him if there was room for anyone like me in the Navy. I knew a lot of people in show business had been drafted, but I hadn't heard of any in the Navy. So, I asked him whether I could be of any use in the Navy. He said I most certainly could, and together with a Captain Ginrick, who was his aide, they were going to—they asked me if I wanted a commission. I said I thought I would be better off going in as an enlisted man because I could do more for the enlisted men. There were more of them.

So, I went overseas shortly after that.

I went back to Washington and was given permission to see a Captain Bledsoe—he was then a captain, and since then was made an admiral—who was in charge of all enlisted personnel.

At my request he allowed me to recruit a number of men in the Navy, which I did here at 90 Church Street, New York, and we worked up a Navy band made up of Navy personnel and went out to the South Pacific, where he assured me we could do a job.

After we got down to the South Pacific, in the combat area—we went to Guadalcanal and other forward areas, as close to the front as we could get—that was then up front—Admiral Halsey and other people came down, such as Admiral Nimitz, and led me to believe I did a good job down there.

I feel—I wouldn't ordinarily bring this up, but you are asking for this information.

Well, at any rate, shortly after that I came back to the United States. We served a tour of duty down there—the normal period of time, I think, was 14 to 18 months, although I am not sure of the exact duration of the period—and were sent back to the United States then for reorganization. Many of the men had taken sick. I, myself, was in pretty bad shape, and actually I must be guilty of a deception to the United States Government at that point. I ordinarily would not have been allowed to enlist in the Navy had I told them this information when I went down. My left ear has not functioned very well since I was about 24. I had to hide that to get in. When I came back to the United States it was discovered I couldn't hear with this ear; also, by that time, I had developed a sort of operation—what they called operation fatigue. We had been down there on a very rigorous schedule, and they called me in for a medical examination. I had migraine headaches, severe ones which used to incapacitate me for a

day or two, and at that time they separated me or discharged me from the Navy—

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, on your—

Mr. SHAW (continuing). With a medical discharge.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Return from the Navy, where did you take up your work again as a musician?

Mr. SHAW. Well, I didn't at first. I was in pretty bad shape for a while, and I was living at that time in California, in Los Angeles—Beverly Hills, to be exact.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you living in Beverly Hills?

Mr. SHAW. Well, now let's see if I can remember the address. I've lived at so many places—it's a little difficult. When I first got out of the Navy, I stayed with my father-in-law. I stayed at his house until I could get located. I had a home in Hollywood, but it was rented at that time and I couldn't get back into it. There were all kinds of restrictions about that. So, I had to live at my father-in-law's house for a while. After I found the house, I bought one. It was in Beverly Hills, on Bedford Drive, but the address is a little vague in my mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain as a resident of Los Angeles?

Mr. SHAW. I stayed there from the time I was discharged from the Navy—well, outside of a few months, during which time I rented a car—I was discharged in San Francisco—at the Oakland Naval Hospital, to be precise—I rented a car and drove around California for a while. I was sort of at loose ends. I didn't know quite what I was going to do with myself. I was pretty beat up at that time. Then I moved down to Hollywood, or Beverly Hills. I lived there, I think, until the latter part of 1946 or early part of 1947. I am not too clear as to the exact dates, but that could be verified.

Mr. TAVENNER. So, you were in Los Angeles between 1944 and 1946—

Mr. SHAW. Or 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Or 1947?

Mr. SHAW. From the middle of 1944 up until 1946 or the beginning of 1947, as close as I can remember now. I could verify it exactly, but—

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed during that period of time?

Mr. SHAW. I have never been employed, actually. I've always been self-employed.

Mr. TAVENNER. What work were you engaged in?

Mr. SHAW. In music, when I was engaged in anything. I did some recordings at first. I had an old contract with RCA Victor, which had been signed during the war and which had been suspended during the duration. So, at first I confined myself to recording.

I was actually looking for some work in the Hollywood area. I wanted, if possible, to locate out there and just find some place where I could sit still for a while and work at my profession; but that is always difficult in my profession because most of my work is on the road, as you probably know.

Anyway, I lived out there during that period of time, trying to get myself set out there and to work out there. In the end, I wasn't

able to succeed and what I did do, instead, was put a band together for various periods and go out for short road tours—road engagements. That would mean one-night stands.

I did—let me see—was that before? No; that was before the war.

I sometimes get very vague about these engagements because I've played so many of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think that is sufficiently in detail.

Mr. SHAW. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware, Mr. Shaw—I suppose you are—that the committee has been making an investigation over a period of time of Communist activities in the entertainment field, with special reference to the moving picture enterprise?

Mr. SHAW. Yes; I certainly am aware of that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has endeavored to ascertain to what extent the Communist Party was successful in infiltrating the entertainment field at Hollywood, what the purposes of the Communist Party were in the effort it was making, and the methods by which it pursued its objectives.

Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, in the course of our investigation, information has come to the attention of the committee which would indicate that you had some knowledge of the operations of the Communist Party during the period between 1945 and 1946 and maybe for a later period.

Now, first of all, I want to ask you if you became acquainted with a person by the name of Paul Perlin?

Mr. SHAW. Paul who?

Mr. SHAW. Perlin—P-e-r-l-i-n.

Mr. SHAW. If so, not under that name; I don't know that name. I've never heard it, to my conscious knowledge, before.

May I say, first of all, that I'm going to answer every question you ask me as honestly and as fully as I possibly can.

So, that being the first one, I can only say I don't know that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly I can give a further identification of him which may refresh your recollection.

Mr. SHAW. I'd be glad if you could, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Max Silver, who was the organizational secretary of the Communist Party of Los Angeles County, one of the top functionaries of the Communist Party in Los Angeles, testified before this committee that Paul Perlin was an organizer of a branch of the Communist Party composed of studio workers and that he participated in a number of small functionary meetings—that is, that Paul Perlin did—and, further, during the course of our investigation a witness by the name of Mr. Leo Townsend identified——

Mr. SHAW. Leo who?

Mr. TAVENNER. Townsend—T-o-w-n-s-e-n-d—testified that Paul Perlin had been sent to his group of the Communist Party as a lecturer in Marxism.

Now, does that information relating to Paul Perlin help to refresh your recollection?

Mr. SHAW. I could say something, which I think will come in later, as part of the whole story I can give you, which may easily implicate this man; but I never knew him by name, if it is the same man. There was a lecture in Marxism that I did have one encounter with, and I'll be very glad to tell you all I know about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, if you prefer to discuss it later——

Mr. SHAW. Well, it doesn't matter.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). That is all right.

Mr. SHAW. I could bring it up now, if you like, but it is part of the entire story I could tell you of about a period of a month to 6 weeks. I believe that is the outside—6 weeks. It is about a month in which I had some connection with these men—a mistaken kind of connection, because I am sure there were assumptions made which I could not be held responsible for; and I will be glad to explain that when the time comes, if you want me to. I can wait until then, or——

Mr. TAVENNER. Let's wait until the time comes.

Mr. SHAW. All right; that is up to you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Hy Kraft?

Mr. SHAW. Yes; I knew Mr. Kraft.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Leo Townsend?

Mr. SHAW. No; I don't know that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. And Mrs. Townsend, his wife?

Mr. SHAW. I don't know that name. I don't know Mr. Townsend's name.

There were a lot of people—I must make this clear—there were a lot of people whom I knew around the film industry, or know around the film industry, whom I know by sight or whom I have seen here and there at parties, and what not, whose names I don't know.

It's quite possible I might know these people very casually, but certainly not by name, and they are certainly not friends. They might have been very vague acquaintances.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Leo Townsend testified before the committee at some length regarding his own Communist Party membership, and both he and his wife have given sworn statements to the committee describing some of their experiences and the activities of various persons who were associated in the work with them.

Now, I will read to you the testimony of Mr. Townsend, or his sworn statement, rather, which identifies you so that you may know exactly what the testimony has been before the committee.

Mr. Wheeler, in his questioning of Mr. Townsend, asked:

Did you ever have occasion to meet Artie Shaw as a Communist?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; Artie Shaw was brought into our branch of the Communist Party. I would think, in the year 1946—1945 or 1946. He attended 5 or 6 Communist Party branch meetings, and he attended 4 or 5 Marxist classes which were conducted by Paul Perlin, who was sent to our branch as an instructor by the county Communist organization.

Mr. WHEELER. Do you recall who brought Artie Shaw into the group?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I don't recall who brought Artie Shaw in.

Mr. WHEELER. Do you recall of any friction which existed among the Communist Party because of his recruitment?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; I remember a conversation between my wife, who was a member of that branch at the time, and a man named Hy Kraft, who was a friend of Shaw's and who was also a member or had been of the Communist Party. He was greatly annoyed at whoever had recruited Artie Shaw on the ground that Shaw would be a bad Communist.

Mr. SHAW. Well, I'm afraid he had me right there.

I didn't know that Mr. Kraft was a Communist. I can tell you that now, and I may as well tell you this story right now——

Mr. TAVENNER. Well——

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Because it bears in exactly with what you have just said.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, first, I want to ask you specifically the question: Were you a member of the Communist Party group as mentioned by Mr. Townsend?

Mr. SHAW. I can only say there that this is, in my opinion, false testimony. Part of it is directly false and some of it can only—I can only say to the best of my knowledge is false.

Now, that—thereby hangs this whole story that I've been referring to.

If I may, I would like to clear that all up now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. SHAW. My recruitment, if any—

Mr. VELDE. Well, just a minute, Mr. Witness.

Mr. SHAW. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. I think the question was very simple and is easy to answer, and I believe, before you go ahead, you should answer the question that was put to you by counsel, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW. I thought I had answered when I said to the best of my knowledge I have never been a member of the Communist Party.

Now, the words "to the best of my knowledge" require some explanation—I am aware of that—and that is what I am preparing to do—is to explain that—

Mr. VELDE. All right; proceed.

Mr. SHAW. And I am trying very hard to be unequivocal about all this, and I would like very much to make as clear a story as I can about this. So, if you gentlemen will bear with me, I'll give to you this story exactly as I remember it and exactly as it was.

This whole thing about the suspicion of me is quite justified, and I can explain the basis on which that arose.

First of all, I did know Mr. Kraft. My work with Mr. Kraft was with one screenplay, which we endeavored to sell together. As a matter of fact, we sold an option of this screenplay to RKO. This was in about 1945, or maybe 1946. I'm not sure, as I say, as to the dates; but this also is on the record. We worked on a story together, which we were going to try to put together for Frank Sinatra, who was then around Hollywood looking for a screenplay. Kraft had an idea and he thought I could get two certain people at RKO, which I could have. I knew the people at studios, and, with my public reputation, I could gain entree to various places that he couldn't.

He was rather unsuccessful at the time as a screenwriter, and I realize now one of the things he was doing was using me to help him to get a job. I did. I helped him get a job.

We subsequently had a fight and split up about the job because, as it turned out, I did most of the actual writing on the screenplay but he refused to let me have any screen credit, rather than—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I don't want to go into any personal difficulties—

Mr. SHAW. No; I am not—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). With you and Mr. Kraft.

Mr. SHAW. No; I'm not doing that. I am just explaining my difficulties with Mr. Kraft.

Shortly after that I became quite active in the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions,

known as HICCASP out there; and after I joined the thing and attended several meetings of that, I was made a member of the executive council, which consisted of 100 members of the film colony, most of whom were nationally—of national reputation—nationally known—men like Dore Schary; men like, at that time, Walter Wanger—this was before his unfortunate affair that hit the papers some while ago—and people of that kind.

I joined that and one day, after I had been a member of the executive council of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as closely as I can remember now, a month or 2, or maybe 3 months, I received a phone call at my office.

I had a little office in Beverly Hills, where I used to do my work. This phone call was from a man who described himself as a friend of various friends of mine—people who were on the executive council. He wanted to speak to me about some HICCASP business. I asked him to identify himself, and he said it wouldn't mean anything to me if he did.

So, I said, "What can I do for you?"

He said, "I would like to see you for about 5 or 10 minutes at your convenience—any time at your convenience."

We made an appointment for the following day. He then came to my office, still not giving his name. He came into my office and we sat down and talked. He then told me he knew various people on the executive council of the HICCASP who had told him that they thought I might be recruited as a member of the Communist Party, that I might be willing to become a member of the Communist Party.

I told him at that time it had never been my intention—it had never been any intention of mine—to become a member of the Communist Party; I wasn't clearly acquainted with the objectives of it, and I thought I was doing about all I could as an individual in the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

The issues at that time in HICCASP was concerned with state-wide fair—FEPC—the fair-employment practice thing, and the extension of the OPA program, which was then in debate as to whether it would continue or not.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, did we establish the date of this?

Mr. SHAW. Well, I can give you the date as closely—

Mr. TAVENNER. The witness has not.

Mr. SHAW. It should be difficult for me to give you the date. I can say it was some time around, in 1946.

It would be very difficult for me to tell you when, but I would say some time in the middle of 1946.

Mr. WEINBERGER. Mr. Velde, I might help the witness to establish a date by referring to a matter unconcerned with this, if I may.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, it has been a rule, a custom of the committee to allow counsel to confer with his client, with the witness, but make no voluntary statements—and I am sure your statement is meant in all sincerity—

Mr. WEINBERGER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). But that has been the rule.

Mr. WEINBERGER. May I speak to him, and just refer him—

Mr. VELDE. Certainly.

(At this point Mr. Shaw conferred with Mr. Weinberger.)

MR. SHAW. Then, it was previous to July 1946. I would say a matter of months previous—several months previous—to 1946 that this occurred.

This man then asked me whether I had ever thought of joining the Communist Party. I said I had never thought of it.

I had been occasionally asked by various people—when I was in New York in 1941 I was asked—

MR. TAVENNER. Let me ask you at this point: Who was that person?

MR. SHAW. Now, that is what I was coming to.

MR. TAVENNER. Oh, all right; yes.

MR. SHAW. This is the man I first thought you might be talking about when you said the first name—Paul—

MR. TAVENNER. Paul Perlin.

MR. SHAW (continuing). Paul Perlin.

This man's name—I asked him, first of all, who were the members of the party of the executive council of HICCASP who had referred him to me.

He refused to give me any names, unless—he said unless I were a member he had to regard certain security rules that they functioned by.

I then asked him for his name. The only name he would give me was Herb, for quite awhile. His first name was Herb. Herb was his first name, and his last name was White or Wright, as I remember. That is my best recollection. I only saw him once after that. After that, I talked to him only 2 or 3 times on the telephone.

I might explain that in the course of this he called me several times after that.

At any rate, the one thing he said to me—he said if it seemed to me I was interested in the functions of such organizations as HICCASP, it was my clear duty to investigate what the Communist Party offered and how the Communist Party operated within these organizations, and I maybe could be doing a service to the things they were interested in if I could see how they operated.

I said, "Well, I'll be very glad to see how they operate."

He said, "The only way to do that is to attend some meetings."

I said, "Well, I will be glad—very glad—to attend meetings."

He said, "You can't attend the meetings unless you are a party member."

I said, "Well, I am not going to be a party member—I want to make that clear—before I know what I am getting into, and I will not sign any cards or an application to become one."

I said, "How do you get around that?"

He says, "I have with me a form which, if you sign, you can go to these meetings."

I said, "I refuse to put my name on any such thing."

He said, "Would you do this: Would you be willing to go to a couple or 3 or 4 meetings in order to see if you could be of service?"

"You will probably find people there who are also members of the executive council of HICCASP, and you will see how they work."

My assumption was they, these people, were going in there on the same basis I was—that they were trying to recruit us into this thing.

Now, I asked him if that was so, and he said, "As much as I can tell you, that is so."



He was quite mysterious about it. There was kind of a cloak-and-dagger atmosphere about the entire thing.

Finally I said, "The only thing I can do is this: I would be willing to go to some meetings with these people I know and let—to see what your objectives are; but if it is something I don't agree with, I certainly want no part of it. But I am perfectly willing to see what it is."

He said, "All right; we can do it on this basis: If you will put any name you want, just so you can sign a piece of paper, so that I can go back to my people"—that is the way he put it, "my people"—"and show them—say to them you signed this piece of paper"—

I said, "What are you going to do with this piece of paper if I sign it, if I put a name, any name, on it—some name I make up?"

He said, "That's all. It doesn't matter if I tear it up afterward. It is of no value to us because it will not be a membership card; but, because of that, I can clear you to go to these meetings."

What I did was to sign a piece of paper, which he said he had on him, which was, as far as I could see, not a party card. I read the thing carefully, and he said it was simply something to sign to enable me to go to meetings as a participant or as an observer. I signed that piece of paper and asked him then what he was going to do with it. He said this was going to be his way of clearing me to go to these meetings.

I went after that to one—he gave me an address.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. May I interrupt the witness?

Did you sign your own name to that?

Mr. SHAW. I certainly did not. I made up some name.

Mr. FRAZIER. Could you tell us the name?

Mr. SHAW. No.

Mr. FRAZIER. Do you recall the name?

Mr. SHAW. I don't. It was some fantastic name. I made up something idiotic.

I said, "This is silly, if you think this is going to do you any good."

He said, "No; it's only so I can clear you."

Now, I am confident this was one of the times referred to in the testimony.

And he said, "I am confident if you go to a few of these meetings this will be what you want to do."

I have been led to believe this is how it is done.

So, I did that. I gave him that. As far as I know, he told me he was going to tear it up. That was to the best of my knowledge.

Well, I knew it could be of no use to him. My own name wasn't on there, and there was no name of anybody I knew on there.

I had never had anything to do with joining anything like that, and—now, if I may, I'll come to the—the other testimony.

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt a minute?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. You know, Mr. Shaw, do you not, that persons in the party did use assumed or fictitious names?

Mr. SHAW. I have been told that since. I didn't know at the time.

Mr. SCHERER. You have learned it since—

Mr. SHAW. I have since learned that.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). That they are carried on the rolls of the party——

Mr. SHAW. I found it out——

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Under assumed or fictitious names?

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Shortly after, and I will tell you what the whole situation was—and this is something I want to make perfectly clear because I was absolutely misled into one set of assumptions which later turned out to be something else, I learned.

I will explain all of that, if I may.

Mr. CLARDY. Whatever name you used, it was neither the name with which you were baptized——

Mr. SHAW. No.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Nor the name——

Mr. SHAW. It had nothing to do with me, or anybody I knew. It was just as if I reached in the sky and pulled out a name like Joseph Sam. I have no idea what the name was. It was just the first name that occurred to me.

Mr. SCHERER. You have learned since that is a common practice in the party?

Mr. SHAW. I don't know what the common practice is. I have been told there are party names——

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Which are not the names of the individuals; but that I also was on a Communist Party membership card—this was not that. To the best of my knowledge, that was an ordinary card which would enable me—which would enable him to clear me to go to these meetings for the purpose of my finding out what they were about.

That is all I know about that part.

At any rate, he gave me the address of a home, at which on the following Wednesday or Thursday, or some night during the week, there would be a meeting; and I went to this meeting, and at the door—it was a rather informal gathering—I was met at the door by a woman who introduced herself to me as the hostess.

There were no names mentioned at the meetings. At the most, I would hear first names—John or Joe, or Jack—whatever the names were; and if they were women, it would be Mary, or whatever the names were.

I was asked to come in and sit down. They weren't quite ready to start. I came in and sat down. It was very informal. People were smoking and just sitting around.

A short time later this woman took a chair and said, "The meeting is called to order."

Mr. CLARDY. You said "this woman." Will you identify her?

Mr. SHAW. I can't, because she introduced herself to me as the hostess.

I might tell you this house was somewhere in Laurel Canyon. I had the address at the time, but I haven't got it any more. I don't remember it now. That was the only time I was at that place.

Mr. CLARDY. That is a pretty long street.

Mr. SHAW. No; Laurel Canyon is not even a street. That is the trouble.

Mr. CLARDY. I have been on it.

Mr. SHAW. It winds around, and you just go to the address. There are the cars there, the house, cars in front of the house, and you get out of your car and go up. That is what I did.

Mr. CLARDY. You would recognize it if you went there again, I take it?

Mr. SHAW. That is hard to know. I presume I would, if the cars were there. I am sure I would if the cars were there.

At any rate, it was a house up, off the road, on a hill.

And I'll try to recollect this to the absolute best of my ability.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right; just proceed.

Mr. SHAW. I went into this room, and there were a group of people; and, finally, 2 or 3 others came in, and there were some people from the executive council or of the HICCASP there—and most of them I didn't know at all, and I assumed that those were ordinary rank-and-file members of the HICCASP.

This, so far as I know, was HICCASP business, and the idea was to see how this operated insofar as the Communist Party was concerned. I understand they were trying to supervise or organize a group within the HICCASP executive council.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. How long after you first became a member of this organization called the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions did this incident take place?

Mr. SHAW. That, as I say, was several months after I became a member of the executive council.

Mr. CLARDY. This was sometime in 1946?

Mr. SHAW. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you.

Mr. SCHERER. You said when you went to this meeting there were certain people there who you could not recognize?

Mr. SHAW. No; I said most of them.

Mr. SCHERER. Most of them you did not recognize?

Mr. SHAW. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. You did recognize some of them, then?

Mr. SHAW. That's right.

Mr. SCHERER. Can you remember and tell us who you did recognize?

Mr. SHAW. I will be glad to mention the names under the condition that it be clearly understood I do not know whether they were in my category there or whether they were—I don't know whether they were members of any Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. We understand that, but would you mind telling us who the persons were at that meeting whom you did know and did recognize?

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think if the witness is going to mention any names they should be mentioned in executive session and not in public session.

Mr. SHAW. I would be very happy to have it that way.

Mr. KEARNEY. I don't think it is fair to the individuals to have the names mentioned here at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. If there is uncertainty about their membership—

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. SHAW. That is the point. I can say nothing about their status because I know they couldn't say anything about my status at that time.

Mr. CLARDY. May I inquire, Mr. Chairman: We are not talking about a meeting of the party; we are talking about the meeting of this Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions—

Mr. SHAW. As far as—

Mr. CLARDY. Am I correct?

Mr. SHAW. As far as I know, it was a meeting of the group from the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.

Mr. CLARDY. I see.

Mr. SHAW. It was not the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. It was described to me as a caucus, to be exact.

Mr. CLARDY. I understood you to say it was a meeting called by the group of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. SHAW. No; I was told about this meeting by Mr. Herb White or Wright—

Mr. CLARDY. I see.

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Who called on me.

Mr. CLARDY. I am sorry.

Mr. SHAW. That is the first I heard about the meeting. I—

Mr. CLARDY. I am incorrect. I thought it was the other, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Let me get this correct. Did you understand this to be a meeting of the Communist Party or a branch of the Communist Party?

Mr. SHAW. What I understood it to be was a group of Hollywood—a group of members of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions who were being attempted—that they were attempting to organize within the framework of the Communist Party. I did not know whether it was a member—whether it was a group of the Communist Party members or not a group of the Communist Party members.

Mr. VELDE. And you would be willing to give us the names of those you remember in executive session?

Mr. SHAW. Actually, they are names I am sure you know.

Mr. VELDE. The committee has no desire—in fact, we try our best not—to name anyone who is not connected with subversive influences in any way, and we appreciate your cooperating.

Mr. SHAW. I would be glad to give you the names on the clear understanding that I cannot state what their actual status was.

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. SHAW. I wouldn't want to be in position of bearing testimony against a man whose status I didn't know.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question at that point?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Shaw, were any of those individuals who were in attendance known to you to be members or did they ever become known to you to be members of the Communist Party subsequently, either by public hearings, or other identifications?

Mr. SHAW. I can answer you—these are people whose names I have seen in connection with hearings on this question; but I have no way of knowing whether they were or were not.

Mr. JACKSON. I see.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean they are persons who have been identified before this committee as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. SHAW. Not identified. They have been questioned in front of this—I don't know whether it was this committee, but one—

Mr. CLARDY. I see.

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Or one of the branches of this committee.

Mr. CLARDY. As to whether they were actually named party members, you are uncertain?

Mr. SHAW. I can't know that because I never followed it that closely. I only remember seeing their names.

Actually, there were 2 and at the most 3 who I saw.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I think, in view of the testimony of the witness and his answers to the questions in the last minute or two, we ought to hear him testify in executive session as to the names of these folks and not release their names unless they are positively identified as members of the Communist Party.

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that is in line with our established policy—

Mr. VELDE. I agree.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And we ought to follow it here.

Mr. VELDE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SHAW. Can I, then, finish this part of my story?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to interrupt you at that point to clarify one matter that is in my mind at least.

This meeting that you attended apparently was a Communist Party meeting because you have told us that you couldn't have gotten into the meeting unless you signed a card which this man White or Wright would have to take back to his people.

Mr. SHAW. That is right, but the point is: What he gave me to understand very clearly was this was a group of people who, like myself, were being approached to become members of the Communist Party and work within the party direction or framework in the group, the HICCASP, of which we were already members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SHAW. So, I didn't know whether it was actually a party membership or a kind of—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you wouldn't have to sign a card or a paper, using a fictitious name, to meet with a bunch of your own coworkers in HICCASP?

Mr. SHAW. Well, the point was—

Mr. TAVENNER. It would only be in the event you and others were being invited to a Communist Party meeting to discuss matters—

Mr. SHAW. I understood it was not a Communist Party meeting so much as it was a meeting of people, some of whom were and some of whom were not Communists, in an attempt to get those who weren't to join and become Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Why, then, would it be necessary for Mr. White or Mr. Wright to take back a piece of paper to his people in order to get you into the meeting?

Mr. SHAW. I suppose because he did not want me to be in a position of knowing anyone there, unless I was willing to show I was willing to give them a chance and willing to listen to what they had to say.

He made it on the basis of security. There may be people there I would recognize, and unless I was willing to do this they couldn't trust me to come.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Witness, at any rate, it was your understanding that the meeting was being conducted by people who were trying to proselyte persons into the party?

Mr. SHAW. That's right; exactly.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. CLARDY. So that it was your definite understanding that the meeting was being conducted by the members of the party—

Mr. SHAW. That's right, sir.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). In an effort to get others to become members?

Mr. SHAW. That is right.

Mr. CLARDY. That is your understanding?

Mr. SHAW. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. Then, wouldn't you agree with counsel—it was a Communist Party meeting, even though some of you there were merely pilgrims along the road and they were trying to persuade you to join?

Mr. SHAW. I suppose you could put it that way. I would hate to say it was a Communist Party meeting because that usually means Communists—I mean a group of people, all of whom are members.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, that is probably a conclusion, but all the facts would lead in one direction, wouldn't they?

Mr. SHAW. Certainly. I would not hesitate to say the meeting was conducted by—purely for members of the party.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what you meant earlier when you said you thought some of these suspicions were probably logical, when you started out, because you did attend things of this kind?

Mr. SHAW. Not only that—because, as I say, it was found out quickly I was going to be a bad Communist, and I was dropped about as quickly as I was picked.

Anyway, do you want me to go on?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, if you will proceed, please.

Mr. SHAW. Anyway, I went to that meeting. That meeting concerned itself primarily with a discussion as to how the executive council—the hundred people of the executive council—could best be moved in regard to establishing an FEPC—fair employment practices—and an extension of the OPA, or in order to carry on the OPA. It concerned itself with that and seemed to me rather harmless at the time.

It was a question—I didn't like too much the idea, and I raised this objection several times during the evening, and was kind of put down as a rather naive person who didn't understand these matters. One of the questions I raised was, if this was what we were after, "Why don't we do it in the executive council, because that is where we—"

we are talking about working within the executive council—why don't we do that——”

MR. CLARDY. Just a moment. Is that the executive council of this independent group that you have identified?

MR. SHAW. Yes; that is the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

MR. CLARDY. Yes.

MR. SHAW. And I said, “why do we have to have this meeting for that purpose?”

I mean, we discussed that at the executive council. I didn't see the need for what they called the caucus meeting.

I was then told the reason for it was this showed me how the operation went. There was a certain amount of organization done at these meetings, which later paid off in the council meetings so we would not—we would not have any difficulties among ourselves—when it came to voting on an issue, we would all know how to go after the thing we wanted, which was to get the HICCASP to throw its weight behind the FEPC and the OPA thing.

Well, that didn't seem too unreasonable an explanation. So, I went away and, as I was leaving that evening—the meeting took place at around, oh, I'd say 9 o'clock, 8:30, something like that, it lasted about an hour, or an hour and a quarter at the most; it was just a short and rather informal thing—I was then told by the hostess, the woman who let me in at the door, that the next meeting would take place at such-and-such an address—I think 2 weeks, or 1 week at that time—at that date—and that was an address somewhere in Hollywood, or Beverly Hills. I can't remember just where because I went in all to 4 of these meetings, to the best of my recollection, one of which was one of these lectures.

Mr. Townsend is in error there. I won't say he is lying, but he is in error as to the amount of these things I went to.

The second meeting was one which had very little bearing on anything I was interested in at all. The meeting took place under similar circumstances. In this case, I was let in—well, the door was open, as a matter of fact. I heard, “Come in,” as I rang the bell. There were certain people sitting around a good-sized living room, and again they were talking, and so on. They waited for a few people. No one addressed any of the people by any but first names. I waited a while, and again the meeting was called to order by someone who assumed the chairmanship of the meeting. I assumed they knew what they were doing, and I sat there.

At this meeting the discussion mostly had to do with the Hollywood Screen Writers' Guild activities. I, not being a member of the Hollywood Screen Writers' Guild at that time could see—and still couldn't see—very little point in my being there; but I listened to what they were talking about, and they were talking about various Screen Writers' Guild activities, and whether they should do this, or do that, whether so-and-so should be allowed to get away with this screen credit, and there was sort of a shop-talking kind of meeting.

I contributed very little to this thing. I just sat there and, for the most part, didn't open my mouth; and some time toward the end of this I observed to someone next to me—I said, “What am I doing here? I have no connection with this.”

They said, "Well, these meetings sometimes take this form. Sometimes they take another form. We want you to have a rounded picture of the activities of this group."

So, I—

Mr. TAVENNER. Were the same people in control of the conduct of this meeting as the previous meeting?

Mr. SHAW. No; in each case there would be a different so-called chairman. As I say, it is very difficult to describe because it wasn't a formal meeting as such. It was just as though you were in your living room.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you observe pamphlets and booklets there—

Mr. SHAW. No.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). And their being made available—

Mr. SHAW. No; there was no such thing.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). For the members?

Mr. SHAW. There was no such thing.

I am coming to that in a moment.

As far as my part is concerned—

Mr. CLARDY. You said the chairman changed, but did the general membership of the meeting remain about the same, with a few different persons?

Mr. SHAW. Well, there would be—at the first meeting, as closely as I can remember, there would be—well, these were small groups—there might have been 14 to 20. There weren't 20. There couldn't have been 20 people.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, as to the subsequent meetings—

Mr. SHAW. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). At the subsequent meetings, did you recognize any of the faces of the people who showed up at the first one?

Mr. SHAW. Some—some I did not—at the first one—of the faces I recognized from the first one. One of those I knew did, and one did not. Most of them I did not know. As I said, I only saw 2 people I positively knew.

Mr. CLARDY. These characters we didn't have you name a moment ago—did they run like a thread through all of the meetings?

Mr. SHAW. They were, as I say, not at all the meetings.

Mr. CLARDY. Most of them, though?

Mr. SHAW. As I say, there were only two I can positively identify, and a third I would hate to identify because I may have them confused with the executive council.

Mr. CLARDY. But some who appeared at the first meeting did appear at subsequent meetings?

Mr. SHAW. Yes, and only 1 or 2, possibly both, of these people I recognized.

As I say, there is very little I can tell you beyond what I have already told you.

The first one dealt with FEPC and OPA and how the HICCASP, the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, could be moved to behave organizedly and concertedly in the direction of perpetuating OPA and—how do I say it? Promulgating the effort of statewide FEPC, which seemed to me at that time perfectly normal and perfectly justifiable procedure.



I wasn't too happy about the idea of carrying it out under those circumstances, rather than at the open meeting but, at any rate, that is what they told me—it was more easily done this way.

The second meeting had to do almost primarily—almost entirely, that is—with the Screen Writers' Guild activities and, since I had no voice in that, had been to no meetings, and had no participation in it, I asked what I was doing there; and once I got up and made some suggestion that, since I had nothing to do with this organization, it was probably just as well if I didn't stay.

And someone then said, "Well, you may as well stay and see how this thing operates."

MR. TAVENNER. Did Hy Kraft attend any of these meetings?

MR. SHAW. Never. He was never at any of these meetings; but I would have suspected him of being a Communist, although I didn't know he was a Communist.

MR. CLARDY. You say you would have suspected him of being a Communist?

MR. SHAW. I would have suspected him of being one, because there were—I felt—Communists in the meetings. I mean, I felt—I was there as a member of the executive council of HICCASP, because he came to ask me to be a member—become a member—of the Communist Party, attend these meetings and become a member. So, I assume there were others there who were.

MR. TAVENNER. Did the person who induced you to come to the meeting in the first place attend the meetings himself?

MR. SHAW. No; he wasn't there.

MR. TAVENNER. He wasn't there?

MR. SHAW. No. I never saw him after that meeting—after that visit to my office. I had 1 phone call from him, and that was the end of it—no; 2 phone calls—and I've never seen him since.

MR. TAVENNER. But he was a member of the executive council of HICCASP?

MR. SHAW. No; he didn't have anything to do with the executive council.

MR. TAVENNER. Oh, he didn't?

MR. SHAW. No.

MR. TAVENNER. He did, though, know someone on the executive council—

MR. SHAW. Yes, who had referred him to me. That is why I saw him to begin with. I never saw him since, after that first visit to my house, or my office.

I know this sounds, as I say, very mysterious; but that is the way it worked.

Anyway, the second meeting—as I say, the second meeting was this Screen Writers' Guild meeting; and there was one subsequent to that, which was a very short one, and also had to do with some issue of HICCASP. I was present at that meeting. On this one, the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was redrafting its charter, and one of the purposes—one of the purposes of the redrafting of the charter was to contain a statement that the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was against communism in any form whatsoever. This was recommended by one of the members of the

executive council and was passed on as a resolution—I mean, was not passed on—was put to vote. Certain members of the HICCASP council were against this resolution; others were for it. The thing was pretty well split down the middle.

The basis of it was that some of them felt since we were not primarily an organization concerned with what they called red baiting we should not have that in there; others said we should come out very clearly against communism.

So, the thing was a pretty hot issue for a while.

On the third meeting of this same kind of group I went to that was the issue, and it was pretty well determined at that time all of those present at that meeting who were members of the executive council, or members of HICCASP, whether of the council or in the rank and file, should vote against the issue of the HICCASP coming out against communism.

MR. TAVENNER. Doesn't it appear to you that this meeting was a meeting of Communist Party members who were attempting to fashion the policies of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee—

MR. SHAW. I was just going to say—

MR. TAVENNER (continuing). Of the Arts, Sciences and Professions?

MR. SHAW (continuing). At the end of that meeting, I spoke to the person who chaired that meeting, and I said, "Look, it seems to me, if this is the way I am being treated now—I am being told what to do. I haven't yet made up my mind as to this issue. I am being told what to do, and I haven't yet decided to join this thing. I am here as an observer. I am not here as a participant, but as an observer."

I then told him about the incident of how I came to the first meeting. There was kind of a shocked look. I was greeted with a kind of a shocked look at that time.

Oh, it was a woman this time. The first time it was a woman; the third time it was a woman; the second time it was a man who chaired the meeting.

There was a rather shocked look, an incredulous look, and I said, "Look, if this is the tenor of these things, I don't think I want to come to any of these things any more."

After that—at any rate, that was not argued at all. There was no issue made of it at all. "Well, you suit yourself"—more or less that was the tone of it, but it was sort of suspicious and sort of incredulous that I didn't want to belong to this thing.

I then heard nothing further from them about another meeting. They didn't tell me at that point there was another meeting. Usually the policy was—at the end of the meeting, the thing was discussed and you were told where to come.

Shortly after that, I received another call from this Herb White or Wright, telling me there had been a certain amount of carping about my presence at these things, and asking me what I had done and what I felt about them.

I said—well, I didn't think I should belong to this. I didn't see any point in my being there.

I have told you very little as to what probably went on at these meetings. It was a little fresher at the time, but it seemed to me it made very little sense. First of all, I was the only person there with

a kind of—well, nationally known name I have; and it was, well, very awkward. They couldn't—in other words I didn't know who most of the people were, and yet they seemed, all of them, to know who I was—or most of them seemed to know who I was. I felt I was at some kind of a disadvantage. I felt if there was going to be any secrecy about this, the least I could do was to have as much secrecy as anyone else.

He then asked me if I would like to go to a Marxist lecture class. He described this as a class in which I would be given a thorough grounding in what the objectives of the party were.

This is what I thought I was going to do the first time, to see whether I would make up my mind to join this thing.

He then told me about this Marxist lecture meeting, at which this man—that is the one I said earlier may have been the name you were talking about—

Mr. TAVENNER. Paul Perlin.

Mr. SHAW. Paul Perlin.

I went to this meeting, and the lecture meeting took place again at someone's home in one of the canyons around Beverly Hills, or Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you see any of the people at that meeting you had seen at the other meetings?

Mr. SHAW. None of the people who had been at the other meetings were present at this meeting—not one of them—at least that I can remember. It may be that some of the people were there, but I didn't know them; I didn't remember them, to the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SHAW. There were none, to the best of my recollection.

The other three meetings had nothing to do with this one. I gathered this was rather—I think right now that meeting—rather, this lecture thing—was made up of people who, like myself, were uncertain as to where they wanted to go or what they wanted to do, and this was an attempt to show them how the thing functioned and an attempt to clarify it so they could make a decision as to whether they wanted to sign a card.

At any rate, the meeting had to do with mostly international policies.

Mr. TAVENNER. So, that means you attended four of these meetings?

(Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. SHAW. Three meetings and one lecture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time—

Mr. SHAW. Well, during—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Were those meetings held?

Mr. SHAW. During the period I told you about—as I say, from a month to 6 weeks previous to July 1946.

At this lecture meeting there was a lot of, oh, large—an awful lot of large—there were a lot of large statements made about international policy, and so on and so forth, and I wasn't very concerned with it. I mean, I just didn't care about it one way or another. It didn't mean very much to me. It didn't interest me very much, and I sat there for about an hour, an hour and a quarter, and listened to this man talk. At the end of that time, I left. I informed someone

I wasn't coming back to these things any more, and that was the end of any of these meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you——

Mr. SHAW. I once heard——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Pay any dues?

Mr. SHAW. No; I never paid anybody anything.

I then heard once more from Mr. White or Mr. Wright, asking me whether I definitely made up my mind that I didn't want to come to these things.

I said I did not.

He said, "Well, I will appreciate one thing: If you don't, will you forget anything you have heard or seen at these meetings?"

I said O. K.; that was all right with me—and that was the end of that period.

I have never seen him since, or heard from him since.

And if that lecturer that night was Paul Perlin, I think I would have to say I have seen him; but I certainly didn't know his name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you see dues collected from other persons?

Mr. SHAW. No; I did not. Things were done, as I say, very informally. That is the reason, as I say, to this date I don't know whether they were or were not actually party meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given any Communist Party literature to read and study?

Mr. SHAW. No; I wasn't. I went to the meetings; left the meetings as I came.

Mr. SCHERER. There wasn't anything said at those meetings, as I understand it, from your testimony, Mr. Shaw, that would require this gentleman to say to you, "Will you forget anything you saw or heard at the meeting?"

Mr. SHAW. I don't know. All he did was say that to me. I suppose what he meant—would I forget the 2 or 3 people I might have seen that I might have known.

Mr. SCHERER. Oh, and not the substance of the discussion?

Mr. SHAW. Well, yes, the substance of the last lecture meeting. I might very well have been asked to forget that. It had to do with international policies of Stalin as against Roosevelt and Churchill—and it was all pretty big grand strategy stuff. I can't tell you what that was about because I have no experience on those matters. I have never been politically minded—a political-minded man, anyway, except on specific issues. I mean, I have joined organizations which had to do with words like democracy and peace.

And I am at the point now where I am afraid to join any organization. I haven't joined an organization for 3 years because I don't know what any word stands for any more.

Mr. SCHERER. While I have got the floor, I would like to ask you this question: During your testimony you said "If there is going to be any secrecy about this, I would like as much secrecy as anyone else."

Mr. SHAW. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. What did you mean by that statement?

Mr. SHAW. Well, what they were saying to me was: Nobody in these things was allowed to talk. In other words, nobody would know who was going to be at the meetings; the membership was never known to anyone. In other words, if we were sitting around here and I didn't

know the name of anybody here and you didn't know the name of me, if we agreed no one was to know anybody else, it seems to me I am at a disadvantage if everybody knows me and I don't know anybody else there.

Mr. SCHERER. You were right when you said it was a cloak-and-dagger outfit!

Mr. SHAW. It seemed like that to me.

Mr. SCHERER. That was your statement.

Mr. SHAW. It seemed like that. It seemed like cops and robbers.

Frankly, at about the third meeting I said: "I don't see any sense in that. If we are going to discuss FEPC in this manner, in a closed session like this, I don't want to join, because I can discuss these things, discuss these questions on FEPC, as I have discussed them, openly and quite loudly at the executive council session of HICCASP"—and not only I but, as I say, an awful lot, a large number of reputable Hollywood citizens. I mean men like Dore Schary. No one ever accused him of being a Communist, and he was as strong and as emphatic as anybody could be about FEPC.

So, I couldn't see sitting around in a closed session to discuss something I was perfectly willing to discuss openly.

And the other stuff had to do with the Screen Writers' Guild, which I had nothing to do with or knew anything about.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you aware of the fact there was a heavy concentration of the Communist Party in the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. SHAW. I have heard that; but, look, I have heard all kinds of stuff. I have heard lies about myself all over the place, and I can know when a thing is a lie about me. I heard—well, the papers were filled with stuff about me, for example—a good example of that is the World Peace Conference, or World Peace Congress thing, which took place in 1949 or 1950. I signed that as a sponsor. Before I signed it—I, by that time, had gotten very leery of signing anything—and they asked me—a man approached me on this. Some fellow came up to my place, to the place I was working, and said, "Would you sign a petition for the World Peace Congress?"

I said, "Who are some of the people who have signed it?"

He said, "Oh, such people as Eugene Ormandy, Einstein, Thomas Mann."

I said, "Sure; I will be glad to put my name down with them."

Mr. JACKSON. My comment on the Screen Writers' Guild was not a contention.

Mr. SHAW. I understand.

Mr. JACKSON. It was a statement of fact—

Mr. SHAW. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Directed to you in the form of a question—

Mr. SHAW. I understand.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). As to whether you knew at that time there was a heavy concentration of Communist Party members in the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. SHAW. I am just trying to explain one point.

Shortly after I saw my name on the front pages of either the Herald Tribune or the Times here, both of which are perfectly sound papers, saying I was in Paris, and in the back section there was a review of a concert I played in Carnegie Hall during the same week.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean the Paris Peace Conference, which followed the one in New York?

Mr. SHAW. That's right.

I never had any intention of going to it. I never had any intention of going to the one at the Waldorf-Astoria.<sup>1</sup> I was very busy with a small symphony at the time, and I certainly had no time to attend or participate in any such thing as that; but I was contacted just as a sponsor, not an attendant, and I put my name down—and there were any number of reputable persons on the list, any number of preachers, reverends. It seemed to me perfectly all right.

Mr. SCHERER. You did say at the opening of your testimony here this morning—I believe I got your exact words—"I can see this whole suspicion of me is justified." You meant the suspicion of possible membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. SHAW. I was——

Mr. SCHERER. Is that what you meant?

Mr. SHAW. I was making, I would say—I suppose—a sort of framework. As I remember, Mr. Tavenner said one of the people testified and said he was a little angry at my being allowed at these meetings because he was afraid of my being a bad Communist. I said that suspicion was justified, in that I was a bad Communist.

The fact of the matter is I wasn't any kind of Communist at all.

Mr. CLARDY. All Communists are bad, aren't they?

Mr. SHAW. I suppose so; but to a Communist that is a good one, a bad Communist is a bad one or—well I am getting all tangled up—but, at any rate, I was certainly a bad Communist. It was never my intention to be one, and to the best of my knowledge I have never been one, although these people may have assumed I was, as I could probably assume some of those people were.

Mr. CLARDY. So, you meant earlier because of these things you have done their suspicions were justified, in their mind, at least?

Mr. SHAW. I suppose so; and that is why I should hate to testify that a man I saw at one of those meetings was a Communist. He might have been there in the same capacity I was, and I would hate to damage a man on that basis.

That is why I said it was going to take a little while to explain that. It is a fairly involved story, but it is the truth—and I think you will agree.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, it is certainly most unusual, in that you used a scheme of deception to get into the Communist Party meetings——

Mr. SHAW. I didn't——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). By indicating you had signed a card——

Mr. SHAW. I didn't——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Or something equivalent——

Mr. SHAW. I didn't——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Through the inducements of your friend, Mr. White or Mr. Wright.

Mr. SHAW. "My friend" is hardly the word.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well——

Mr. SHAW. Anyway, he is the one who told me this would be his way of allowing me to come. I didn't want it. I didn't want to

<sup>1</sup> Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, held in New York City, March 25-27, 1949.

go; but, you see, when he said, "How would you like to see how it operates? I would appreciate it if you would see how it operates, and you will see other people you know there"—I thought, "What can I lose?"

I was curious. I'll be perfectly honest about it. I was curious.

Mr. TAVENNER. But the whole basis of the scheme to get you into the meeting was to lend credence to the belief by other persons that you were actually a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SHAW. What he told me was not that. That is the point. He told me—he simply told me—this was his way of clearing one, and that did not indicate my intention of becoming one or being one, because actually I signed a false name to the card.

Mr. TAVENNER. That isn't quite all, because he had to take it back to the people he was associated with before you could be brought to the meeting.

Mr. SHAW. He did tell me this—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SHAW (continuing). And this, again, as far as I can remember—what he said—almost his exact words—because this was very important to me—this part of it—he said, "I have to clear this with my people."

I said, "Well, look, this card, you must understand—I don't sign this as me. If you want a phoney name on there, I'll put it on there."

He said, "Look, as far as the card is concerned, it means nothing. I can tear it up, but I can go back, without lying, and say you have signed a card, which will enable me to get you in."

Mr. TAVENNER. That is what I am referring to—this device of a deceptive nature to make other people believe you were a member of the party.

Mr. SHAW. That is what I am trying to explain. That is the reason I feel I was hoodwinked about that, because now you show me testimony by a man who says I was a member because I was at these meetings—

Mr. TAVENNER. And that is where—

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Which I resent fiercely.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). The membership discussed the advisability of your being a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SHAW. I was never really recruited. They attempted to recruit me, and, as I have told you here, the only statement I ever made was: "I cannot answer that. I would like to see it. I am very curious to see how it works."

And I was, and I must admit that.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Mr. Shaw, didn't you try to create in the mind of the person or persons to whom you gave this piece of paper with a false name on it the general idea that you were at least in the market for membership?

Mr. SHAW. He told me that he was told that their program was something that I would sympathize with—

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, and you, knowing—

Mr. SHAW (continuing). And I said, "I don't know I would sympathize with it, but certainly I am willing to listen to you, if that is the way you put it."

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you understood, of course, what they were trying to interest you in was membership in the Communist Party, from what you have said?

Mr. SHAW. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, don't you agree further with counsel the reason they asked you to adopt this deceptive device he has described and to attend the meeting was because you at least had given them reason to believe that you might become a Communist?

Mr. SHAW. That is quite possible.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, they weren't—

Mr. SHAW. I could only answer that by saying—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Inviting you just for the fun of it?

Mr. SHAW. No; I think they were—

Mr. CLARDY. It was a very serious thing?

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Trying to get some pretty big names—names that were prominent before the public—and I guess I was a name they wanted to have there.

Mr. CLARDY. Didn't it occur to you at that time precisely what they were after—

Mr. SHAW. It did.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). That by using your name—

Mr. SHAW. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). By getting your name and using your name—they could get others in the party?

Mr. SHAW. It did; but this is the only answer I can give you: At the executive council of the HICCASP I was a pretty hot fellow. I was a pretty firebrandish young man at that point.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you had some sympathies with what you generally understood to be the Communist objectives—

Mr. SHAW. I don't think—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Or you wouldn't have attended those meetings?

Mr. SHAW. I don't think that is true, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, what sympathies did you have with what—

Mr. SHAW. The Fair Employment Practices Committee—the FEPC.

Mr. CLARDY. That is one specific thing. Is that all?

Mr. SHAW. That was the main issue in HICCASP when I was at HICCASP. That issue was discussed right straight down the line.

The only other thing—temporary thing—was when Gerald L. K. Smith was coming to town. There was a big civic furor over that, and HICCASP was in the vanguard of that to deny him the right of the board of education facilities to speak.

That sort of thing I was very angry about. I just came out of the war, and I was very angry about a lot of things. There was a lot of black-marketeering and an awful lot of other things going on that I didn't like.

I think you can understand a man who has been out in the Pacific and lost most of his hair, lost almost all his teeth, and got to the point where he doesn't know whether he's going to be able to make a living again at a profession that he made a lot of money at can be a little disgruntled.

There were a lot of things going on that I was very unhappy about—and I am not the only ex-serviceman to say that, or feel that way. It is an old story.

Mr. CLARDY. And based on that you were willing at least to explore what the Communist Party had to offer?



Mr. SHAW. Well, based on that and——

Mr. CLARDY. Just answer the question directly. I said: Based on that you were willing at least to explore what the Communist Party had to offer?

Mr. SHAW. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. And you did?

Mr. SHAW. I did.

Mr. SCHERER. You said you were in the vanguard of those opposing Gerald L. K. Smith using the public auditorium?

Mr. SHAW. No, sir; I said the HICCASP was in the vanguard of those opposing him.

Mr. SCHERER. The HICCASP was in the vanguard?

Mr. SHAW. Yes; the HICCASP was in the vanguard.

Mr. SCHERER. But you didn't want him to speak?

Mr. SHAW. We didn't even want him to speak in that town. We felt anything he could say could have nothing but harm to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Shaw——

Mr. SHAW. Those were the specific issues on which I was at that time fighting for and very much interested in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Shaw, our investigation of the activities of the Communist Party in Hollywood has been very revealing as to the methods they used in connection with Communist-front organizations.

Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have found that the Communist Party used Communist-front organizations as a recruiting ground——

Mr. SHAW. That has been my experience.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). For members quite frequently.

Mr. SHAW. The experiences of mine bear it out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your experience fits in with that perfectly.

On the other hand, we have an equal amount of evidence indicating that once a person becomes a member of the Communist Party he is expected to go out into what are known as the mass organizations for the purpose of carrying the Communist Party line to the Communist-front organizations, just as this group of Communists was attempting to influence the policies of your organization.

Mr. SHAW. Correct.

Well, if you will—if you'll look at my record, you'll see my joining of other organizations was almost entirely before this episode. I wasn't simply joining then with anything to do in that connection.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is very interesting.

Mr. SHAW. That is probably why they thought——

Mr. TAVENNER. I note from my examination of your membership in Communist-front organizations, though, you were a member of the American Peace Mobilization, which was back along 1940.

Mr. SHAW. That's right, just before America got into the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were a member of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions at least as early as 1945.

Mr. SHAW. Yes; that was after I got out of the Navy.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you also were in there in 1946.

Mr. SHAW. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you were a member of the executive committee during those 2 years.

Mr. SHAW. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And then, subsequent to that, you were a member of the Committee for Democratic Far Eastern Policy for quite a long period of time.

Mr. SHAW. That one—that is—I don't know what that is all about. I think I remember someone asking me if I would put my letter—my name on a letterhead—it had something to do with democratic Far Eastern policy—and I think—I'm pretty sure I must have said yes to that, because it sounded perfectly harmless and, as a matter of fact, a beneficial kind of thing; but I was never any member in a sense of being active, and—

Mr. TAVENNER. No—I should not have said "member." You were a sponsor; that is, your name appears as a sponsor on the letterhead of the organization for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Mr. SHAW. Well, actually, I suppose the reason it appears that long is that I never had any opportunity or any reason to take my name off it.

I didn't even know it was still functioning.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Mr. Counsel, what year was that for the last time his name was on the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

I didn't hear it.

Mr. TAVENNER. His name appears on letterheads which we have dated November 2, 1946, July 11, 1947, and May 28, 1948.

Mr. CLARDY. Perhaps you better ask the witness when he authorized that to be done to establish a better date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Can you give us more information on that?

Mr. SHAW. I suppose the earliest date you had there would be the closest one to which I authorized it.

I know this was just one of those phone-call things, or probably a letter in the mail, that solicited my name on this.

Certainly the committee—the title of it—the Committee for Democratic Far Eastern Policy sounded to me—still sounds to me—like a rather innocuous thing. I don't know—certainly I didn't think there was anything subversive about it at that time; and, as far as the name is concerned, it seems to me it would be a good thing if we had a democratic Far Eastern policy right now, as well as then. If we had had one then, maybe—

Mr. TAVENNER. You realize the Communists used all the catch names and phrases that the human mind could conceive of—

Mr. SHAW. Well, I—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). To fool people and get them to come into organizations of a Communist-front type?

Mr. SHAW. I am becoming increasingly aware of that. I mean, the word "peace" has become something I am suspicious of now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, and even "religion" has been misused by the Communist Party.

Mr. SHAW. Well, I can only answer—my only answer to that is: If any mistakes were made on that basis, I have to plead guilty to making mistakes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). May I ask a question?

When, after all, you finally determined this Committee for Democratic Far Eastern Policy was a Communist-front organization—

Mr. SHAW. Well, I never really paid any attention to the thing.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Did you ever make a positive attempt—

Mr. SHAW. I have no knowledge of it at all.

Someone wrote me saying, "Will you sponsor this?"

It sounded good to me. Here were the aims to promote democracy in China, in Japan, and it sounded like a good idea to me.

I said, "Sure; you can have"—

Mr. JACKSON. Is this the first time—

Mr. SHAW (continuing). My name on there.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). You had any knowledge your name had been used as a sponsor by organizations—

Mr. SHAW. I knew, but as far as—

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Which were Communist-front organizations?

Mr. SHAW (continuing). I knew some of them were fronts long ago, but I didn't even know this still existed. I saw it today in my record.

Mr. JACKSON. It existed until at least 1948.

The point is: Did you ever make a positive, affirmative effort to have your sponsorship, the use of your name as a sponsor, withdrawn?

Mr. SHAW. No, because I've never seen any mail, or had nothing to do with that. I never heard of the organization until 2 days ago when that thing—Mr. Weinberger has a copy of a report of my activities in which that is mentioned. I was amazed to see it there. I thought this was one of those little sporadic things that 6 people had gotten together to present to their Congressmen, or something.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you—

Mr. JACKSON. Do you—

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe—

Mr. SHAW. Had I known, I would certainly have liked to disaffiliate.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Your name as a sponsor of that organization did, in fact, lend a certain amount of aid to the Communist influences behind it?

Mr. SHAW. If I at that time had any vague suspicion there were Communists or Communist influences behind it, you may be sure my name wouldn't have been anywhere near it.

Mr. JACKSON. Granting that, my question is: Do you believe the use of your name enhanced the organization?

Mr. SHAW. Yes; it probably did, and that is why I feel so bad about it. I feel the use of my name on a lot of these things should have been—should not have been granted; but at that time I can only say the intent on my part when I granted them was not to do anything disloyal.

I have never in my life done anything disloyal to this country. The only thing I can tell you is that my record as an American citizen will bear that out.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Counsel, when was that organization designated as a Communist-front organization, and by whom?

Mr. SHAW. It was certainly not at that time I joined it. I am sure of that, because I would have been aware of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was cited as Communist and subversive by the Attorney General April 27, 1949—

Mr. SHAW. And when did I join it?

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). And by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1948.

Mr. SHAW. When did I join?

Mr. TAVENNER. You were a member or a sponsor—

Mr. SHAW. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). For the 3 years—1946—

Mr. SHAW. In other words—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). 1947—

Mr. SHAW. In other words, I gave them the use of my name in 1946, and could have hardly known at that time it would have been later cited as subversive.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the point is: During the years 1946, 1947, and 1948 the activities of the organization were such, during the time your name was being used, as to bring it within the scope of official investigation.

Mr. SHAW. May I ask—

Mr. JACKSON. That is the important thing, isn't it?

Mr. SHAW. May I get it clear—make it clear right now that I don't know whether this—this committee has a record of it, but I have a belief—it seems to me that in every one of these instances I always used to examine the letterhead and see what other people were on it. It was my way at that time of trying to safeguard myself of doing something that was wrong or mistaken; and whenever I would see really reputable names on these things I would say, "Go ahead."

I have an idea that if you examine that letterhead you are bound to find some other names—names of other people—who couldn't possibly be Communists.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, but you understand that other people, looking at the letterhead and seeing the name of Artie Shaw, would say, "It must be all right; there is Artie Shaw."

Mr. SHAW. That's right, but I started with someone else on there.

Mr. JACKSON. That is right.

Mr. SHAW. And I suppose it snowballed, in other words, and my lending my name made it roll up more.

Mr. JACKSON. Which is precisely the Communist attack—

Mr. SHAW. Yes; as I say, I am aware of that.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Just to get those people's names—

Mr. SHAW (continuing). I have been made aware of that.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). On letterheads as sponsors and members in order to attract others who will also in turn use their names—

Mr. SHAW. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Or lend their names.

Mr. SHAW. I understand that.

Mr. JACKSON. It is a vicious cycle.

Mr. SHAW. I understand that, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. And quite possibly this is how your name was used, and also quite possibly aid and comfort was inadvertently given the party and the organization by the use of your name as a sponsor.

Mr. SHAW. As I say, I am beginning to see that, and I can only tell you—certainly if it was done, it was inadvertent on my part. I would have never done that without knowing this was what it ostensibly said it was in my case.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Shaw, without mentioning any names, do you recall who it was who requested the use of your name as a sponsor to this organization?

Mr. SHAW. Gee, I wish I could—in answer to that, I wish I could show you my mail. You would be amazed at the organizations I get letters from. I can't—

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Shaw—

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Begin to tell you—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). You don't know whether this was a telephone call or—

Mr. SHAW. As I say, some general secretary or chairman will come to me—"Would you please lend your name to this?"

I get this all the time. My mail is filled with such requests—anything from a nonethereal symphony on up or down. I mean, I get these all the time. Some seem rather worthy causes, and it is very hard sometimes to turn them down, when someone comes to me to put my name on something to defend some guy who is being persecuted or having a hard time. It may turn out to have been a mistake. I have now learned it is better to be sure, but at that time I thought—well, even if I make two mistakes, I would rather do one good thing than not do anything at all.

Mr. JACKSON. Don't you have a professional clearing house for organizations which are approved for benefits—

Mr. SHAW. Unfortunately—

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). And thing of that sort?

Mr. SHAW (continuing). There is no such thing.

I had this discussion with a man not long ago, when he asked me how I could have been naive enough to join the congress—the World Peace Congress—put my name on that. I said to him, "Do you know of any other peace congress I can join? I want peace."

He says, "That is the Communist-inspired one."

I said, "Get me a Republican Party-inspired one and I'll join that. I don't care which one"—

Mr. VELDE. The committee must have order—

Mr. SHAW. That wasn't meant—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). In the hearings, and we will countenance no further demonstrations, favorable or unfavorable.

Mr. SHAW. I wasn't bidding for any applause, I assure you.

Mr. VELDE. I am sure you weren't Mr. Shaw.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Mr. Shaw, as these organizations you joined were one by one shown to have been Communist-inspired, don't you think it would have been the best wisdom to have, in writing, withdrawn and disassociated yourself from them?

Mr. SHAW. I see that now. I do see that now.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest we have a short recess.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in recess for 10 minutes.

(The hearing was recessed at 12 o'clock, to reconvene at 12:10 o'clock.)

(The hearing reconvened at 12:10 o'clock, the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chair-

man, Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Shaw, we have been speaking of Communist-front organizations, and your affiliation with some of them.

Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You appeared to have been a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress.

Mr. SHAW. I would like to—like to deny that, sir. That is not true. I never gave my name—gave permission for my name on that one, as well as many others I have seen on this record. My name was used falsely. I mean, I just did not give my name on it. In fact, I don't remember—I remember being approached several times on it, and this I was clearly informed was a group of people trying to foment trouble. I never put my name on it. If my name was used, it distinctly was without my permission.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a notice showing that your name appears as a sponsor of the Los Angeles chapter.

Mr. SHAW. Yes; I see.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean to say you did not give authority—

Mr. SHAW. I do, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). For the use of your name?

Mr. SHAW. I do; very definitely.

There are several others in this list I have in front of me in which my name is completely unauthorized.

May I just add one thing to that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SHAW. There are at times, I think you will understand—there are times when it is very difficult for a person in my position to know when his name is being used; and there is no ordinary procedure—at least I don't know of any procedure without going to a lot of trouble—by which a person, like me, can say, "Stop using my name." I might write them a note to that effect, saying, "I don't want you to use my name any further," but I don't know that would guarantee that any organization would stop using my name. You see, a lot of these things are sporadic. They print their letterheads, and they don't want to go to the trouble of unprinting them.

So, that is all I can answer you about that. I know on that one my name was never authorized.

Mr. TAVENNER. You recall the occasion of the hearing of the 10 from Hollywood before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947?

Mr. SHAW. I heard of it, but I do not know much about it. I didn't follow it very closely.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are reported as one of those who came from New York down to Washington on that occasion and as having spoken against the committee in that hearing.

Mr. SHAW. That is absolutely false.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I am not saying there should be any inference drawn from your speaking against the committee, but what we are interested in is knowing the circumstances under which your consent to speak was given—

Mr. SHAW. The facts are—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). If you did give your consent——

Mr. SHAW. The fact is I never did.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Or did speak.

Mr. SHAW. The fact is I never did speak, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not?

Mr. SHAW. I did not.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you make the trip?

Mr. SHAW. No, sir; I did not. I know nothing about that case. In fact, I know absolutely nothing about that except what I saw in the papers. When you are on the road the way I am, you don't see too much about these things. Some of these papers in the small towns don't even carry some of these things.

Mr. CLARDY. I suppose it would be not too difficult to run down whether you were actually, physically there that day.

Mr. SHAW. Oh, I suppose it would be very easy.

Mr. CLARDY. I am not suggesting that be done now, but I——

Mr. SHAW. In 1947, I think it can be clearly established I was never near Washington at that time; and I had no intention of being there.

Mr. JACKSON. What is the source, may I ask, of the documentation?

Mr. SHAW. It is a ——

Mr. TAVENNER. It is a newspaper account——

Mr. SHAW. Pardon me?

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Of the Daily Worker.

Mr. KEARNEY. I wouldn't put too much faith in that.

Mr. SHAW. No; if we are going to use them as witnesses, we're all in serious trouble, I am afraid.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, did that specifically say he was present——

Mr. SHAW. I don't think you can completely believe some of these things——

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Or was it merely a story saying he was to appear?

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Because that is like that Paris thing, where I was supposed to appear and never was even there.

Mr. TAVENNER. It says: "Movie and State celebrities who acted and spoke against the inquisition during the week included some of the biggest names of Hollywood and Broadway," and then it gives a list of those. The delegation to Washington was led by certain persons from Hollywood and from Broadway, and it names certain persons including Artie Shaw.

Mr. SHAW. Is that the one—may I ask—I think I remember seeing something in the papers—about Humphrey Bogart being down there?

Mr. TAVENNER. That's right.

Mr. SHAW. I remember that. I was not with them—and I'll swear on any stack of Bibles to that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, it is not unusual for the Communist Party to use the names of persons——

Mr. SHAW. No.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). For their own purpose——

Mr. SHAW. Exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Without authority——

Mr. SHAW. Exactly, and in this case without even consulting me at all.

Mr. JACKSON. You had no call or no reference to this?

Mr. SHAW. None, sir. I was never even approached on this. If I was, I certainly would not have done it. If I was approached, my answer would have been, "No." I had no sympathy with that. I wanted no part of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, shortly after that the Civil Rights Congress advertised in the Daily Worker of November 11, 1947, that "New York Answers the Witch Hunt" and it gives the various names of those who were to take part in the program, and among them Artie Shaw.

Mr. SHAW. This is again the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; a rally.

Mr. SHAW. I don't remember any such occasion.

Can you give me more details about it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SHAW. As far as I know, I have never sponsored any—

Mr. TAVENNER. This was at the St. Nicholas Arena November the 13th.

Mr. VELDE. What year?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1947?

And this was given out on November 11.

Mr. SHAW. I see. Well—

Mr. TAVENNER. So, it is an indication of those who were expected to appear. It is not—

Mr. SHAW. That might have been.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Those who did appear.

Mr. SHAW. I don't know anything about the civil-liberties thing, because I know—as far as I know, I didn't have any connection with it.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you attend any such rally at—

Mr. SHAW. As far as I know—

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). St. Nicholas Arena?

Mr. SHAW. As far as I remember, I think there were some rallies. I don't think they had anything to do with this. There were rallies at Madison Square Garden, and other places, and I believe I attended some of those.

Mr. SCHERER. But you did attend some?

Mr. SHAW. Well, I was at many—some of these shows, and some of them were big Broadway-star benefits. There were an awful lot of people there—people in every field; people in the field of popular music; stage, radio, television people. Men from all walks of this profession—all walks of life—were there; and I may have been at some of them.

But I don't remember this at all, and I know it had nothing to do with this Hollywood 10 thing because I never had any sympathies with it, and wouldn't have.

Mr. CLARDY. You were acquainted with the Hollywood 10 because of your activities generally?

Mr. SHAW. I knew some of them, but I wouldn't say I was well acquainted with them because they were mostly writers—screen writers—out there.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right.

Mr. SHAW. I would see them on occasion. I mean, if you work at a studio it is pretty hard not to get to know these people; but they



were not social friends. I mean, I didn't see them evenings after work. I might run into them on the studio lot—something of that sort—you know, "Hello"—that kind of thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, there was a group organized known as the Committee for the First Amendment, and you appear to have been one of the original signers—

Mr. SHAW. Again, I can only—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Of the statement of the Committee for the First Amendment.

Mr. SHAW. What exactly was it?

I don't even remember very much about that.

As I say, there for a while I suppose I was a sucker for signing these things. I signed an awful lot of them.

This may have well been one. I can't say I didn't sign it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you recall the circumstances under which your signature was obtained?

Mr. SHAW. I don't even recall the committee. I don't even recall the actual committee. It's like that Far East one. I can't remember much about it.

As far as I am concerned, it probably seemed like a good thing. I mean, the first amendment—it seemed to me a perfectly harmless thing to be on the committee for it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have referred, in a general way, to your having participated as a sponsor in various peace conferences, which I believe you said—

Mr. SHAW. There were two.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). You later found out to be Communist-inspired or controlled.

Mr. SHAW. There were two of them I was definitely informed were, by people who might have known or might not have known, friends of mine, men who were fairly well informed. One was the one before the war. At the time, as I say—

That is the American Peace Mobilization? Is that the name of it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SHAW. At that time I was approached—I was in the east for a short while. I was traveling around on the road. I would come into New York occasionally. I was approached—I think I was living here at the time—I think I remember this one quite well, because they planned a large rally of state delegates from every state in the Union—and they asked me if I would put my name on the American Peace Mobilization plan; and I asked them what it was. As near as I can remember, they explained to me it was an attempt to mobilize all the forces in America which were against war, to keep us out of war, and at that time it seemed to me a perfectly valid objective; and I said, "Of course, you can have my name."

They then asked me to appear at a large rally, and I refused that—first, because I didn't want to and, second, because I was not going to be in New York, anyway. I didn't believe in lending myself professionally. They wanted me to appear with my orchestra on that occasion, and this was something I couldn't do.

That is all I remember about that, and the only other thing I remember is that World Peace Congress which, as I said a while ago, I would have signed if it had been inspired by the American Legion,

or anyone else. It wouldn't have mattered to me because I was positively and wholeheartedly for peace.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the peace conference in Paris, April 1949?

Mr. SHAW. There was apparently one in Paris. The one I signed had to do with a meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was the earlier conference.

Mr. SHAW. That was the only one I signed. The Paris one I didn't sign.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, your name—

Mr. SHAW. That didn't originate—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Appears as a sponsor on the back—

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Didn't take place in this country.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). As an American sponsoring the Committee for the World Congress for Peace.

Mr. SHAW. I believe that it appears.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SHAW. As I say, I saw an item—if you check the press at that time, you would find I was reported as being present in Paris—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SHAW. Which is on the record false. I can show you I was never anywhere near it. In fact, I have never been in Paris.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask him a question, Counsel?

You were a member of that organization you discussed as the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. SHAW. Of Hollywood.

Mr. CLARDY. That later became something else—the National Council—

Mr. SHAW. I was not—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. SHAW. I was not on that. I see my name—

Mr. CLARDY. Don't you remember the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions are the ones that sponsored and the ones that promoted the Waldorf-Astoria meeting in 1949—

Mr. SHAW. I can't—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). At which you were a sponsor?

Mr. SHAW. I was playing at a night club in New York, and I was busily engaged with a symphony, which was quite—something quite unexpected and something I wanted to try; and during that period—it was a very hectic period. The press was very much for it and against it. There was a lot of controversy, and somebody came up to me at one of these rehearsals—and I was pretty harried at that time—somebody came up and said, "Would you please put your name on this, for the World Peace Congress?"

I said, "Who else is on it in my field?"

He gave me absolutely irrefragable names and showed them to me in print on their letter.

Mr. CLARDY. Did that have to do with the Waldorf-Astoria meeting?

Mr. SHAW. That was the Waldorf-Astoria meeting.

He told me there would be delegates from every nation in the world—

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you knew, then—

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Sincerely trying to find some way to—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Because of the petition, or whatever you signed, it must have been sponsored by the successor of that independent group you mentioned—

Mr. SHAW. I didn't sign the thing.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). And was then known as the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. SHAW. I didn't sign anything.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, what did you do to give them permission to use your name?

Mr. SHAW. Well, mostly it was not in writing. They would just ask, "Will you give us your name?"—and I would say, "of course"—or you might sign a card—"I hereby give you permission to use my name on the World Peace Congress letterhead."

Mr. CLARDY. You subsequently became aware of the fact that your name was used?

Mr. SHAW. Oh, my name was used. The papers were full of it. I found myself castigated all over the place, but it sounded to me at that time like a perfectly harmless thing.

Mr. CLARDY. You discovered later it was a Communist-front outfit?

Mr. SHAW. I was told so by any number of people. I never discovered it because I was never near it. I was never around it. I never attended one of the meetings of it.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, the Paris Peace Conference—World Peace Conference—was scheduled by the same outfit, wasn't it?

Mr. SHAW. That I don't know, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you are familiar with the Paris one that followed the one at the Waldorf-Astoria?

Mr. SHAW. No. As I say, all I know about the Paris one is that I saw my name listed as having appeared at it. That was afterward.

Mr. CLARDY. I see.

Mr. SHAW. And I don't know—I saw a number of names—Chaplin, Joliot-Curie; people like that.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you knew it had something to do with the Soviet Union at that time, didn't you?

Mr. SHAW. Well, the papers were full of it, of course.

Mr. CLARDY. And that was a year after the airlift started in Berlin, wasn't it?

Mr. SHAW. I can't connect the two events, because I—

Mr. CLARDY. Well, do you recall when the Berlin airlift started?

Mr. SHAW. I don't now the years.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question to the point of this Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace?

Do you recall or do you have knowledge that the then Secretary of State denounced, in advance of this meeting, this conference for world peace as being an instrument of Soviet foreign policy?

Mr. SHAW. No, sir; I didn't.

Who was the then Secretary of State?

Mr. JACKSON. Secretary Dean Acheson.

Mr. SHAW. No, sir; I did not know that.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know that—

Mr. SHAW. This is the first I heard of it.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). A number of people, who undoubtedly in good faith lent their names to this organization, withdrew from the

organization following that statement and had no part of the conference?

Mr. SHAW. I did not know that. As I say—

Mr. JACKSON. That is a fact.

Mr. SHAW (continuing). I was not in New York after that.

You see, this is one of the difficulties. It's very hard to reach me once I get out on the road.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Shaw, that was a matter of front-page news all across the Nation, and I am sure that was the basis for my colleague's question.

You didn't see anything anywhere about the fact this was denounced by the Secretary of State?

Mr. SHAW. You mean after I had signed it?

Mr. CLARDY. At any time—before or after—

Mr. SHAW. Of course.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you?

Mr. SHAW. Never before; but after, of course. As I say, the papers were full of this.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, did you withdraw from it after the papers—

Mr. SHAW. How do you withdraw from something after it is over?

Mr. CLARDY. The same way some of the others did—by merely withdrawing.

But you didn't do anything, as I understand?

Mr. SHAW. No; I didn't. I didn't go, and I only knew the conference was at the Waldorf. It was picketed, and at that point I was shocked to hear this was what it was supposed to be—I mean, it was not what it was supposed to be.

I was on the road with the band, traveling around, and I paid no attention to it. I had nothing to do with it. I didn't go near it. I thought it was over.

Mr. CLARDY. Didn't the fact the Russians were raising so much Cain with us, and we had to have an airlift going into Berlin, in some way alert you to the fact that any organization dealing with friendship—

Mr. SHAW. I can—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). With Russia was suspect?

Mr. SHAW. I can answer that by saying not since then will you find my name on anything of any kind outside of the American Federation of Musicians.

Mr. CLARDY. What you are saying is you want us to believe that you were extremely naive, shall we say, at that time—

Mr. SHAW. Well, I—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). And didn't investigate thoroughly enough to understand what it was all about?

Mr. SHAW. I investigated only to the extent of seeing people's names on there that I thought were perfectly all right, and that I still do in most cases think they are perfectly all right—and on the basis of that put my name on it.

Since then, I have never signed anything because, as I said earlier, I wouldn't sign anything today unless I had the advice of 7 lawyers and the granting of permission or clearance by this committee.

Mr. CLARDY. I take it your wastebasket is your biggest file on these things, things like this, today?

Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir; and it has been awfully full for 3 years now.

Mr. SCHERER. You realize, then, Mr. Shaw, you were thoroughly duped by the Communist group then, do you not?

Mr. SHAW. In this Communist thing, I certainly was.

Mr. SCHERER. Not this particular thing, but in all of these matters?

Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir. If these things that I joined—in other words, if a committee for democracy is Communist inspired—was Communist inspired—I was a fool; I should not have signed it.

Mr. JACKSON. Democracy is not Communist inspired, but the—

Mr. SHAW. No; I say the committee for it.

I am at a point today if someone says, "Here is a committee for personal freedom," I don't want any part of it. I don't know what these things mean any more.

Mr. JACKSON. They have been used by the Communist Party to the detriment of those words.

Mr. SHAW. I am afraid that is true.

I used to think I knew what freedom and democracy meant.

Mr. CLARKY. The meaning has been pretty well destroyed?

Mr. SHAW. I am afraid so.

Mr. DOYLE. May I just interpolate there?

I was just thinking, as Mr. Shaw has testified, the meaning of these words has not been changed, in my judgment. The words mean just what they have always meant in the history of our Nation. A wrong construction has been put upon them by the Communist conspiracy.

But I was just going to observe to Mr. Shaw now that I hope the jam in which he has found himself has resulted in a desire to fight for world peace and world democracy—using your own language—

Mr. SHAW. That's close enough to it.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And will not discourage you in fighting for the same worthy objectives.

Mr. SHAW. It won't, but it's certainly going to discourage my loose granting of permission to use my name for things.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not advocating you do that; but, of course, I would advocate you be more vigorous than ever against the false use or any misuse of your name by the international conspiracy—

Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And I do want to urge again that you, as a young American, are, it just seems to me, in a position to give some very vigorous leadership for real world peace and real democracy.

Mr. SHAW. I would like nothing better than to know how to do that.

Mr. DOYLE. I, as a member of this committee, don't want you to be bitter or discouraged about those very objectives merely because you find yourself indiscreet, naive in making these moves which developed to be serious mistakes.

Mr. SHAW. Could I say one thing—would it be permissible for me to make a very short statement—in regard to that?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think so.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. SHAW. Well, I would just like to say one thing. This is no prepared statement, or anything. It may sound garbled, but I have, I think, personally, a very large stake in this country, and I want to do everything I can, as I always have, to defend American institutions and American folkways.

This country has been very kind to me. I started out as a minority member of a poor family, and I have come a long way for a guy like me; and I have found on the roads I am met with a lot of love and a lot of affection, and when I was serving in the service that same thing happened. I think one of the members of the committee here could bear that out.

I never had any intention of doing anything detrimental or disloyal to the interests of this country.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Shaw, may I—

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute, Mr. Clardy. Let Mr. Doyle finish.

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me.

Mr. DOYLE. I was just going to ask the witness at this time a couple of questions.

I wrote down, Mr. Shaw, your exact language. I wrote it down with a purpose. You said, "Academically, I have had very little education. I am self-taught in that sense."

Those were your exact words in beginning your answer to the question by our distinguished counsel.

I just wish to say, as one American to another, I want to compliment you on arriving at the pinnacle in your profession, which you did arrive at, as being self-taught and self-made, in spite of the fact you never had or apparently could never make arrangements to have your academic preparation. Some of the rest of us understand what you mean.

Now, because this committee is here under an express assignment, under Public Law 601, passed in the 79th session of Congress in 1945, and that assignment, under statutory law, assigns us, amongst other things, the investigation of all questions in relation to subversive activities which "would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation," I would like to ask you this question: Have you any suggestion to this committee in that area?

In other words, one reason we are here in New York and other cities over the country is that part of our assignment is to study facts and get information which will relate to our obligations to report to Congress recommendations for remedial legislation in the field of subversive activities, whether it is the Communist Party or any other form of totalitarian conspiracy against our constitutional form of government.

Mr. SHAW. Would you like me to answer that?

Mr. DOYLE. Now, with that statement by me, let me ask you: Have you thought out the question? Have you any suggestions to make to the United States Congress—that is your Congress and mine—through this committee? Have you ever thought in the area of whether or not there is any remedial legislation which ought to be enacted by your Congress?

Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir; I have. I have thought a great deal about it.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you give us the benefit of your conclusion or, if you haven't reached any conclusion, give us the benefit of your tentative thinking?

Mr. SHAW. I can give you a kind of tentative conclusion.

It seems to me something could be done—and I, as one citizen, would be very appreciative of seeing it—I would like to see it done. We all have this—how shall I say it?—haze of rumor. This haze of

rumor started about me. It started about 4 years ago, and about 3 years ago it began to affect me as a citizen very seriously. At that time I was approached by various people in the radio and television—in the related fields, friends of mine who knew me very well, who wanted to get me jobs, who offered me things which could have been good for them, and they could have been good to me—and they would say, “Do you realize the cloud you are under? Do you realize you ought to clear yourself of all this suspicion?”

And I would ask every one of them, “How do I clear myself? What way is there?”

I have had to wait 3 years to ask to appear before this committee so I can clear myself in this sense, and I thought there ought to be somewhere some group, some responsible, official party designated by the Congress of the United States, to which people like I could come and appeal, without having to wait to be subpoenaed, where I could go and say, “Could I come and testify as to my part in this so I can once and for all make it clear where I stand now, and where I stood at that time?”

Mr. DOYLE. Well, of course——

Mr. SHAW. Would that be possible?

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). You, no doubt, did not hear over the radio, nor did you see through the press, nor did you hear the statements by the former chairman of this committee, as well as this chairman, and by members of this committee, in this session, and previous sessions, we have had for years a standing invitation, which we thought had been given wide publicity——

Mr. SHAW. I never heard of it, sir.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). For men who had been former Communists and who wished to clean up and help their Nation. We have had a standing invitation.

Mr. SHAW. What is the procedure?

I think that should be much more widely publicized than it is, because, for one, I never knew.

Mr. DOYLE. The procedure is very simple, to communicate your desire to this committee through our office at Washington——

Mr. SHAW. To say you would like to testify?

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). That you would like to come before the committee and testify, even in executive session.

Mr. SHAW. I have never known that, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, let me say again—and I know the chairman of this committee and every member of the committee will back me in my emphasis—that there is that standing invitation, and this committee gives that invitation now again to any American citizen, wherever he is——

Mr. SHAW. I think that——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). To come forward——

Mr. SHAW. I think that should get more wide publicity than it has.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And disclose the Communist activities of the Communist Party, or any other group or any other individual who is subversive, whether he is a Communist or not.

There are other fields of subversive activities in our Nation which are not confined entirely to the Communist conspiracy.

So, let me emphasize, Mr. Shaw—I am sure we members of the committee are all thinking along the same line you are—we are

anxious that men and women who have made the mistakes that you came near making, according to your own testimony—and you want to help your Nation understand the Communist conspiracy—do come forward voluntarily, without waiting for a subpoena.

Mr. SHAW. I certainly would have been in a much better position than I am right now if I had known that——

Mr. DOYLE. Well, will you broadcast——

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Because I have had to come all the way from Arkansas——

Mr. DOYLE. Will you broadcast, from your distinguished position, to the men and women in your profession, and to the people you meet as you travel throughout this great Nation of ours, that this invitation is again given by this committee?

Mr. SHAW. I certainly will do all I can to make that known.

As I said earlier, I could have done this 4 years ago and saved myself the trouble to break a tour, right in the middle of it, to get here.

Mr. DOYLE. We regret that became necessary, too.

Mr. SHAW. I understand.

I am appreciative of the fact I was allowed to come here today so I could do this and—you can take my sincere statement for this—when I got this subpoena, it was like a breath—I was relieved to get it. I wanted to come here and do this. I was really very anxious, as I am sure you must know, to come here and say everything and tell everything I could.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one other question, Mr. Chairman?

I was interested in what proportion of the men and women who attended or what proportion of the persons attending these 3 meetings you attended were men and what proportion were women. You said there were only 14 to 20 people.

Mr. SHAW. Never over that; maybe 16 at the most. Some of them were even smaller than that.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, if only 16 were in attendance, about what proportion were men and about what proportion were women?

Mr. SHAW. About the closest I could recollect would be to say there were a few women. By that, I mean 5 or 6 women, say, out of 15.

Mr. DOYLE. And what would be the approximate age of those people attending those meetings?

Mr. SHAW. They were mostly youngish people——

Mr. DOYLE. Well——

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Mostly young people——

Mr. DOYLE. I mean——

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Young meaning anything from 38 on down; not many over 40, certainly. I mean, you would have noticed any who was over 40. They were mostly young—as I say, mostly people from the film business, or either connected with films—and you know that is a business for young people, for the most part, except for the executives; and at these 3 meetings and the lecture there were no executives there.

Mr. DOYLE. I have just this one further observation, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, and Mr. Shaw: I, of course, have no appreciation of music such as you possess in your heart and soul, but I think I do recognize that through your art, gift of God, you have a great chance to disseminate very vigilant and vigorous expressions



of patriotism for our Nation, and I hope you may find it possible, financially and otherwise, to use the medium of your art, music—

MR. SHAW. I have done so, to the best of my ability.

MR. DOYLE (continuing). To see that the young people, under 28 or under 35—

MR. SHAW. Yes.

MR. DOYLE (continuing). Will become more impressed with what their American citizenship means, more than otherwise as a result of your music.

You understand my thought?

MR. SHAW. I certainly do. I say that to myself continuously, and wherever possible, as a musician, wherever I have been approached, when I have been near a town where any such thing as a Navy or Army base is, I have contributed my services, and I will always be very glad to do that. That is why I joined the Navy—to do that.

MR. DOYLE. Even Americans younger than those in the military forces.

MR. SHAW. They are pretty young—some of them. You would be surprised at the age of some of these kids at these bases. Most of them are young kids who would be my audience, who would be in my audience mostly, except they can't afford to or they can't get off the base in many cases; but ordinarily—I might say last night—I don't even know what the date is any more—night before last I played at the University of Arkansas; and I assure you this is what I tried to do. This is what my whole profession is.

MR. DOYLE. Perhaps you might take a minute for a chosen word or two, as you leave those great audiences in the joy of hearing you and your orchestra play—I have seen band leaders and heard some band leaders take a minute or two—and say something to the audience which has been a great inspiration. Perhaps you might find it convenient.

MR. SHAW. I think I have on occasion done that. It is a hard thing to do because—I mean, sometimes it sounds as though you are saying, "Look where I have gone," and actually you can upset an audience pretty well that way.

MR. DOYLE. Not by preachment, but by example, if you understand my thought—

MR. SHAW. I think I do.

MR. DOYLE. Through your music.

MR. SHAW. I think I do.

MR. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question here.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

MR. CLARDY. The Waldorf-Astoria meeting, as you recall, was in March of 1949—March 26th and 27th of 1949<sup>1</sup>—and the April 4, 1949, issue of Life pretty well sums up your whole attitude of this whole performance of yours in the past. I will read it to you and ask for your comments. In that issue, immediately after the conference, Life said this:

Offhand, it might seem that a propaganda meeting like the one in New York last week would have been regarded by almost all Americans with scorn, but the Communists prepare carefully for such eventuality. Their weapons are the fellow traveler and so-called innocent dupe. These are the prominent people who, wittingly or not, associate themselves with a Communist-front organization

<sup>1</sup> Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace.

and thereby lend the glamor, prestige, or the respectability of American liberalism.

Now, upon reflection, wouldn't you say that pretty well sums up what you have been trying to tell us as to your past connections with these things?

Mr. SHAW. I hate to admit I was a dupe—I don't like the word—and I certainly don't like to have to admit publicly I wasn't responsible for my behavior; but I think that just about accurately states my position in these matters.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, that is the way it seemed to me, and I had this handy; so, I used it on you.

Mr. SHAW. Thank you. That states it pretty clearly for me.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Kearney?

Mr. KEARNEY. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Shaw, as one who listened to your music in South Pacific, I want to say that I think probably this hearing has been beneficial to all concerned. I certainly think it has not been conducted in the manner which will lend any currency or credence to the charges of redbaiting or witch hunting, and I hope you share that feeling—that your constitutional rights have been observed fully—

Mr. SHAW. I feel very good about it.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Here this morning, and we probably have done a good deal to clear up some of the things which have caused so much confusion in the past.

The committee is just as interested in getting people out from under a cloud, if they are unjustly there, as they are in pointing out the truth and facts of the Communist Party membership when they exist.

I think that is a very important fact which is sometimes overlooked by the critics of the committee.

Mr. SHAW. It is not being overlooked by me today, sir. I feel very glad, and I am actually—I suppose it's difficult to say—I hate to have to come in and plead any kind of exculpation because of what I have done in the past. I know ignorance is no excuse, but in these cases I have never broken laws. So, I think I can plead ignorance in regard to having made a great mistake—or great mistakes—in judgment about what I was lending myself to.

Mr. JACKSON. I wouldn't even sign a check without two thoughts these days.

Mr. SHAW. I sign autographs on the back of them occasionally.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy, do you have any further questions?

Mr. CLARDY. I just want to agree with what Congressman Jackson has said.

And, as I understand your testimony, you are not now presently a member of the Communist Party?

(Mr. Shaw responded by shaking his head in the negative.)

Mr. CLARDY. You are saying no there?

Mr. SHAW. You can bet your bottom dollar on it.

Mr. CLARDY. And now that your eyes are opened to how you have been duped and misled in the past, I take it that you do appreciate this opportunity of appearing before the committee and getting your story before the people of the United States?

Mr. SHAW. I certainly do, sir. I welcomed the opportunity before I came here, and now that I am finished I am very glad that I had the opportunity to state my views and state my present status, my present position.

Mr. CLARDY. I am unable to quite see why our invitation—the latch-string was always out—escaped you, but perhaps you have been so immersed in your musical career—

Mr. SHAW. I just wish you could come out on the road with me some time and see—

Mr. CLARDY. We have been on the road, too.

Mr. SHAW. Not quite in the same capacity, I am afraid. This is by way of being a location job for me, compared to the skipping around I do.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I have one further question: We have had some members of your art, profession, whom we believe had been Communists, according to the sworn testimony of from 1 to 6, 7 or 8 witnesses, previously given, come before the committee and refuse to name anyone on the grounds they didn't want to be called stool pigeons—they have used that term—and, yet, you came today and offered to give us names. You didn't plead you wouldn't do so on the ground that you might be called a stool pigeon.

Mr. SHAW. I can answer that for you, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, why—and I am not opening up a door for you to use any names—would you, in your fine art and profession, be willing to come and do this? Wouldn't you consider it putting you in a class of being called a stool pigeon? Wouldn't that be an ignominious name to you? Wouldn't that be a name you would not want to have assigned to you?

Mr. SHAW. Well, could I answer that?

Mr. DOYLE. How do you explain that you were willing to come and help us to that extent?

Mr. SHAW. I can state it this way: If I were unwittingly made or if I were somehow misled into being a partner in something I didn't believe in, or a partner to some kind of crime, I wouldn't consider myself a stool pigeon in going in and giving the names of those people who were the committers of the crime; and I don't believe in the objectives of the Communist Party. I do not believe in that. I can only emphatically state I am against the objectives of the Communist Party in the United States. I don't know what they want in Russia, and that is not my affair, but I do know what I believe about here.

Mr. DOYLE. Then, if I word your answer in a little bit different language, will you tell me if I am in error and if I get your thought? In other words, you feel so strongly that the security of your Nation is more important—

Mr. SHAW. Than any individual.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Than your own personal status—

Mr. SHAW. Yes. I think it is more important—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And you are placing—

Mr. SHAW (continuing). Than any individual status.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). The security of your Nation ahead of any embarrassment or any loss of income?

Mr. SHAW. I think the security of the Nation affects millions of people, and I don't think any one person is more important than millions.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. SHAW. That is about the way it sums up.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. I just want to tell Mr. Shaw we appreciate his appearing here today and giving us a fine statement about his past association with these various organizations; and I want to say also, Mr. Shaw, that we regret that you didn't know that you had an opportunity, like every other man whose name was mentioned here, to come before the committee and to make a clean breast of what has transpired, and either confirm or deny any allegations that have been made before the committee. We welcome any witness to come before the committee.

Mr. SHAW. Thank you. I am sorry, too, I didn't know about it. It could have saved me 2 or 3 years of real heartaches.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Shaw, to avoid needless repetition, I want to say I concur generally in the statements that my colleagues have made about your appearance here, and to say also that we regret we had to cause you inconvenience. Of course, I think you realize any person who is called before the committee to testify necessarily suffers inconvenience. We try to make that as little as possible.

If there is nothing further, Mr. Counsel, the witness, Mr. Shaw, is dismissed with the committee's thanks.

Mr. SHAW. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will stand in recess until 2:30.

(Whereupon, at 12:43 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 2:30 p. m., the same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 2:30 p. m., of the same day, the hearing was resumed, the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Bernard W. Kearney, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle (appearance noted in transcript), and James B. Frazier, Jr.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Mr. Reporter, let the record show at this point present are Mr. Kearney, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, a quorum of the full committee.

Who do you wish to call?

Mr. KUNZIG. The first witness is Mrs. Dorothy K. Funn.

Would you stand to be sworn in, Mrs. Funn?

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand?

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. FUNN. I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Funn, are you represented by counsel—and, if so, would counsel please state his name and address for the record?

Mr. JOHNSON. I am representing Mrs. Dorothy Funn. Norman B. Johnson, 1 Brainbridge Street, Brooklyn 33, New York.

# TESTIMONY OF MRS. DOROTHY K. FUNN, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, NORMAN B. JOHNSON

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Funn, where do you live?

Mrs. FUNN. I live at 1352 Union Street, Brooklyn.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a survey, brief survey, of your educational background?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, I went to elementary school, Public School 5, in Brooklyn; from there to Girls' High School; from there to Maxwell Training School for Teachers, after which I became a teacher in the schools of the city of New York and subsequently, while still teaching, attended classes at some of the colleges of New York City furthering my education. I have attended classes at Columbia, CCNY, New York University.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where are you presently employed, Mrs. Funn?

Mrs. FUNN. At the present time I am a teacher in Public School 129, 640 Quincy Street, Brooklyn.

Mr. KUNZIG. In what position?

Mrs. FUNN. I am an upper-grade teacher—7th and 8th year.

Mr. KUNZIG. How long have you been so employed?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, I was employed by the city of New York from 1923 to 1943, at which time I resigned. I went back into the school system in 1947 and have so remained in that job.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where were you employed from 1943 on, when you said you left the school system?

(Representative Clyde Doyle entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mrs. FUNN. In several capacities: One as the administrative secretary for the Negro Labor Victory Committee; another as the legislative representative for the National Negro Congress, with offices in Washington; another as representative for the New York State CIO Political Action Committee during the 1944 presidential campaign, after which I went back to the previous job of legislative representative; and somewhere in between I also acted as the executive secretary for a committee on unity made up of representatives of organizations and individuals interested in eliminating the cause that had made the riots in Harlem possible about that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Funn, the next question you specifically wanted me to ask you: Are you a Negro, Mrs. Funn?

Mrs. FUNN. I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you maintain your residence in New York during the period you were out of the school system?

Mrs. FUNN. No; not all of the time. I was, what you might term, a commuter for part of the time. Then I did establish residence in Washington, D. C., for, oh, I'd say, about 2 years—permanent residence for about 2 years.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Where was that residence?

Mrs. FUNN. Thirty-one hundred Water—W-a-t-e-r—Street Northwest, Washington, D. C.

Mr. KUNZIG. You left Washington in what year?

Mrs. FUNN. I left Washington in late 1946—I should say about December—and came back to Brooklyn.

Mr. KUNZIG. To teach?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. And now you are still teaching?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Funn, when and where were you born?

Mrs. FUNN. I was born in Brooklyn, N. Y., June 7, 1903.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. No; I am not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; I have.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you become a member?

Mrs. FUNN. I joined the Communist Party in May 1939.

Mr. KUNZIG. And, according to your recollection, when did you leave the party?

Mrs. FUNN. Actually, about June 1946. Ideologically, I would say I had left it many months prior to that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who recruited you into the party, if you remember?

Mrs. FUNN. I do remember. It was a fellow teacher by the name of Morris Salz. At that time—

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that S-a-l-z?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right. He and I were both teaching at the same school—P. S. 3, Brooklyn.

Mr. VELDE. And would you spell the first name?

Mrs. FUNN. Morris—M-o-r-r-i-s.

Mr. KUNZIG. You then knew him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever meet with Morris Salz as a member?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you describe to the committee any activities you may have had with Morris Salz as a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, after I was taken into membership in the Communist Party, I met regularly with him and other members of that group about every 2 weeks on a Tuesday afternoon after school.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was the name of the group that you joined?

Mrs. FUNN. There wasn't any name. I guess that was a protective covering. It was just known as a teaching group of the Bedford-Stuyvesant area.

Mr. KUNZIG. Bedford-Stuyvesant area?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you recall any other names of members of that particular group?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you list them clearly for the committee, please?

Mrs. FUNN. There was a Jeannette Finkelstein.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was she a teacher, or was she a—

Mrs. FUNN. She was a clerk in the schools in Brooklyn. I don't know what school. Her sister, Ruth Finkelstein, was also a clerk in the board of education, New York City.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were Ruth Finkelstein, and Jeannette Finkelstein, both members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. To your knowledge?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who else?

Mrs. FUNN. Ann Nechemias.

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you spell it?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes—N-e-c-h-e-m-i-a-s.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew her as a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. These are people who were in the group with me at the time I joined.

Beatrice Goldberg Pelham—P-e-l-h-a-m.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew her as a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any others?

Mrs. FUNN. Hyman Koppelman—K-o-p-p-e-l-m-a-n; Mildred Flacks—F-l-a-c-k-s.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is she still teaching today, to the best of your knowledge?

Mrs. FUNN. No; I think she was——

You mean Mildred Flacks?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mrs. FUNN. I think she was dismissed under—by the board of education. They had a trial of some of the people, and she was dismissed.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask the counsel to inquire more specifically as to the identification of the person she is naming, if she can give other identification, such as the address, occupation?

There may be other people who have the same name.

Mr. KUNZIG. I was coming to that, sir. I will.

Mr. VELDE. And may I suggest, too—I concur in the suggestion made by Mr. Moulder—you give, if you can, the length of time these various people that you are mentioning were in the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. I will take them up individually.

I was going to do that right after you finished these names, but we will follow the suggestion of the chairman and go back over the names, and starting with Ruth Finkelstein.

You were a member of the party, as I get it, at least with these people as teachers until 1943, when you went to Washington?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then you no longer met with these teachers?

Mrs. FUNN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you describe, to the best of your ability, the meetings, types of meetings, in which Ruth Finkelstein met with you, and anything else you may know about her?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, she met—she and the others I have named so far met—with me in a Communist Party meeting, as I said, regularly every 2 weeks on a Tuesday afternoon after school.

All of those whom I have named or any whom I may name in this particular part of my testimony were members of that teacher group connected with the Bedford-Stuyvesant Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. The Bedford-Stuyvesant section——

Mrs. FUNN. Section of——

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Is that it?

Mrs. FUNN (continuing). The Communist Party; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that in New York?

Mrs. FUNN. No; in Brooklyn, that is.

Mr. KUNZIG. Brooklyn, N. Y.

Wherever you can, will you please give addresses or schools or wherever else these people taught so as to make specific identification, so there will be no confusion as to other people, you see?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, where I can, I will be glad to.

Mr. KUNZIG. Right.

Mrs. FUNN. I don't know with what schools Ruth and Jeannette Finkelstein were connected, but I know they were with Brooklyn schools.

Mr. KUNZIG. What are other names of members that you knew as Communists and that you met with as Communists?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. Edna Rosenberg. She was a teacher at Girls' High School. Her name was really Edna Rosenberg Coleman, whose husband was an organizer for the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any others?

Mrs. FUNN. Robert Cohen. He was a teacher at that time in P. S. 35, Brooklyn.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is he still in the school system, to your knowledge?

Mrs. FUNN. To my knowledge, he still is and is now serving as an assistant principal in some Brooklyn school.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you meet with him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; he was a member of that group, meeting with us on Tuesdays.

Sarah Gilman—G-i-l-m-a-n. She was also a clerk in the schools of New York, in Brooklyn.

Mr. KUNZIG. Rather than a teacher, in other words?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

And Stanley Chapman—C-h-a-p-m-a-n. I don't know where he is now. At the time I knew him he was a teacher in a Brooklyn school.

Mr. VELDE. What duties does the clerk in the school system have?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, she takes care of all records, absences, all the children's records, our payroll—all the clerical work that the principal wants done; everything that his secretary—in another profession, she might be called a secretary, and in many instances a confidential secretary of the principal.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, these teachers were not in any particular school; they were scattered around——

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Is that correct?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

I might add this, however: There were other teachers' groups, about which I didn't know too much. I knew that they were in existence, but the party generally had a group meet together who were in the same area, so that, for instance, PS 35, PS 3, PS 44, of which Beatrice Goldberg—in which Beatrice Goldberg was a teacher—and PS 129—PS 35, PS 3, PS 44, and PS 129—those were all schools within a small radius of each other, and feeling they had common interests would meet together.

Do I make myself clear?



Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you mentioned a Robert Cohen. Was Cohen a member of the group that you were a member of when you joined?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; he was a member of the group then. However, he didn't meet with the group too long after I joined. I recall that in September of 1939 we met—when school started, we started meeting again and I should say by November he had ceased meeting with me. Maybe it was a little bit later than that, but I know his meeting with the group become infrequent, and he gave as his excuse he was studying to take the assistant principal's examination.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, did Mr. Cohen have any particular assignment that would point him out as a member of that group?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. He used to pick up the literature. We had names for the different offices. One would be the literature educational director, and there would be a chairman of the group, and there would be a treasurer of the group, and he brought the literature to the meetings, whether it be pamphlets or booklets or extra newspapers that were to be mailed out to prospects, may I say in quotes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I want to make one point clear: Is it correct that only Communists could attend these meetings to which you are referring?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. No one else was allowed in?

Mrs. FUNN. No one else was allowed into those particular meetings.

Mr. KUNZIG. No novices, learners, or prospects?

Mrs. FUNN. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. These were members of the party?

Mrs. FUNN. These were party members.

There were times when nonparty members were invited, but it was not at a Communist Party meeting.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you use your own name in the party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. We used our own names because we were not functioning out in the open. You might say that we were underground, so to speak. We were teachers, and I guess for, you might say, security reasons or whatever it might be, we were not known as Communist Party members to all and sundry or to the rank-and-file members of the Communist Party in the area.

Mr. SCHERER. Those in the open party, however, did use assumed or fictitious names?

Mrs. FUNN. That I wouldn't know. I didn't come in contact with them.

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like at this point to mention something, Mrs. Funn, because you specifically stated it to me earlier today.

There was a bit of hooting just then from the audience in this courtroom, and there was some hooting and sneering this morning.

You have been a member or had been a member for quite some time of the Communist Party here in this city of New York. There was quite an audience here in this room this morning, and there is quite an audience here this afternoon. Is it correct you recognize quite a number of the people in the audience as former members of the Communist Party when you were?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. They are here today in this audience?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Thank you.

Now, I would like to go back to Ruth Finkelstein. You said she was a clerk, not a teacher. Did she attend any Communist school with you?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you describe that to the committee, please?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, shall I go back to how——

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes; please do.

Mrs. FUNN (continuing). I happened to go?

Mr. KUNZIG. Please do.

Mrs. FUNN. As I said before, I joined the Communist Party in May 1939. About the second meetings after my joining this matter of a State Communist school was brought up in our meeting, and they were asking who would like to attend that school. So, I immediately said, "Well, since I am so new and I know nothing about this whole movement, if there is such a school, I would like to go and learn and see what it's all about."

So, I was taken over to 12th Street—East 12th Street—to the Communist Party headquarters and interviewed by Alberto Moreau, who was known as the educational director of the Communist Party for New York City, and after several questions by him I was then accepted as one of those to attend the New York State training school of the Communist Party.

Mr. VELDE. Can you place the date of that?

Mr. FUNN. When the——

Mr. VELDE. Of that appointment.

Mrs. FUNN. Oh, it was sometime the middle of June 1939, because the school was to start immediately after the Fourth of July. In fact, we left for the school on the Fourth of July.

Do you want——

Mr. KUNZIG. Go right ahead.

Mrs. FUNN. We went—I was told subsequently that I had been accepted, and that I would be ready to leave on the Fourth of July, which I did; and we met over on 12th Street and University Place, where a bus was provided, and the whole group went up to the school, Bergman's farm, outside of Kingston, on that day, and prepared to have ourselves schooled for the next 6 weeks—and, since you mentioned it, Mr. Kunzig, Ruth and Jeannette Finkelstein were among those who attended that school with me, along with others.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Ruth Finkelstein work at the section at all, sometimes in the evenings?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; both she and her sister many times would not accept other assignments in the meeting because they were doing work at the section—what was called the section of the Communist Party—the section of the Communist Party was the office of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Communist Party, located at 1660 Fulton Street.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is 1660 Fulton Street?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, this Mr. Salz, whom you have mentioned as recruiting you—did he have anything in any way to do with the executive committee of the Bedford-Stuyvesant group?

Mrs. FUNN. He served as a member of the executive committee of the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. What other activities did he have in the group?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, he served as chairman of the group—for quite a time as chairman of the group—and you might say the one who would push for something to be done, one way or another, or was—one who guided the group in our meetings and——

Mr. KUNZIG. Did he have anything to do with the finance end of it?

Mrs. FUNN. No, no. There were several financial secretaries during the time I was a member of the group, and one of those, I remember, was Sarah Gilman.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mentioned, I believe, a Mr. Jacobs.

Mrs. FUNN. No; I didn't.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, do you know a Mr. Jacobs in connection with the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is his full name?

Mrs. FUNN. Julius Jacobs. He was not a member of the group to which I belonged. However, he acted as a liaison between the Communist Party and the teacher groups, and oftentimes he would call representatives of the different groups together and give them some information that the Communist Party thought important for the teacher groups to know.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was he also known by another name?

Mrs. FUNN. As I recall, he was called Jack Johnson.

Mr. KUNZIG. And Jack Johnson and Julius Jacobs are the same person?

Mrs. FUNN. Are the same; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you met with Julius Jacobs in Communist Party meetings?

Mrs. FUNN. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you also come to know his wife while you attended these meetings?

Mrs. FUNN. I knew Florence Jacobs, his wife—not at any meetings in the committee, but she was one of those in attendance at the New York State Communist Party School.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were only selected Communists permitted to go to the school?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, they were selected. I guess I was selected because they would then have a Negro in the group, although I found out subsequently they didn't realize I was a Negro; and the others—they didn't—they were taken—their applications were accepted if they had been in the party at least a year.

Mr. KUNZIG. So, no one who wasn't in the party at least a year could go to this school?

Mrs. FUNN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, does it lie within your knowledge whether Mr. and Mrs. Julius Jacobs are now teaching in the New York school system?

Mrs. FUNN. I think they are.

Mr. KUNZIG. They are?

Mrs. FUNN. I think they are.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you happen to know what schools?

Mrs. FUNN. I knew Mrs. Jacobs was teaching at Franklin K. Lane High School, but I don't know whether she's there now.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you, of course, didn't have to wait a year until you went to the school. Could you explain how that came about?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, I—I've said it may have been because I was a Negro, and they always like to have a cross section represented in any of their gatherings—and that may have been one of the reasons—the other because I had said I knew nothing about communism and, since they were having this school, I would like to learn: and, further, that Morris Salz vouched for me.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you have mentioned the clerk, Sarah Gilman Rosenblatt, and I believe you mentioned she had something to do with the finances. Would you expound just a bit upon that—what the duties of the treasurer were and what Sarah Gilman Rosenblatt did——

Mrs. FUNN. The treasurer——

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). In the party?

Mrs. FUNN. The treasurer collected dues and party assessments. They had regular assessments, and maybe it was 10 cents for the section, or maybe it was more. I don't honestly recall the amount of money, but the secretary collected your different assessments, plus your monthly dues, and then arranged to turn those over to some representative of the section. She also kept all records. We never carried party cards.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you had been naming various people you knew as Communists. I don't believe you completed that. Would you continue on giving names that you knew definitely to be Communists, with as much identification as you possibly can give?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, I can give you the names of those who attended school with me. It is not a full list because that's a few years ago and I don't really remember all.

Mr. KUNZIG. Just those which you are absolutely sure about.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. Also attending that party school was Arthur Newman. I think it's N-e-w-m-a-n. He was——

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know whether he is still a teacher?

Mrs. FUNN. No; he isn't. He either resigned or was dismissed from—maybe he's coming up for trial. I'm not sure. However, he taught in the Bronx.

And there was Martha Lepowsky—L-e-p-o-w-s-k-y—who, I understand, has since left the school system. I think she has since married and her last name is Kahn—K-a-h-n. I understand she resigned from the school system.

There was Charlotte Wacker—W-a-c-k-e-r. She taught somewhere in Manhattan. I don't know where.

Mr. VELDE. For what length of time, and during what time was she a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. That I can't tell you.

The people whom I am naming now attended the party school with me, and they came from all sections of the city of New York, and there are a couple of—no; they were all from the city of New York—so that I wouldn't know what happened to a person, say, who was teaching the Bronx or was teaching in Manhattan.

We are a city, but still we are apart in our boroughs, so that our our activity is concentrated in the borough.

Mr. VELDE. Thank you.

Mrs. FUNN. Mildred Grossman—G-r-o-s-s-m-a-n. She's at a high school in the Bronx. I think she is awaiting trial by the board of education.

Sylvia Elfenbein—E-l-f-e-n-b-e-i-n. She was a substitute at that time. I don't think she's in the system at all now.

Clara Rieber—R-i-e-b-e-r—married since, and her last name is Brahdy—B-r-a-h-d-y. She retired in 1951.

Florence Jacobs, whom I have already mentioned.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is the Mrs. Jacobs that is still teaching?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, are there any others?

Mrs. FUNN. Now, those are the only ones attending the school.

There were others who came up from time to time on a Sunday, which was the off day, the rest day, to visit.

There was a Rose Olson, who was a substitute in the schools of New York, and I name her for a specific reason. I mean—I've told you before that all these I knew as members of the party because they were either in a State school with me or met with me in this teacher group. However, I also know that the—the means they took to keep our whereabouts secret meant that anyone coming up to the school was a member of the party in the higher echelons of the party. She was one visitor.

Julius Jacobs came up to see his wife. He was another visitor.

Robert Campbell, organizer for the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of the Communist Party, also visited; and Morris Salz came up to what they termed "the graduation" at the end of the session.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a David Flacks?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. David Flacks is the husband of Mildred Flacks. He was not a member of the group to which I belonged. However, he oftentimes came to our group and stayed for a certain length of time in order to bring a message from the group to which he was attached. That message might be one to ask our cooperation in a giving a—well, having a lecture—I'll put it that way. For instance, if you are a member of the group and you have made a certain number of contacts who you think are possible Communist Party material, you then arrange for a meeting, an open meeting, at someone's home, at which there will be a lecture, followed by discussion, and a charge for it, too—50 cents, a dollar, something of that kind.

That's what I meant when I said earlier there were times when non-Communists were in our midst, but it would be on occasions similar to the one just described.

Mr. KUNZIG. This David Flacks—that is F-l-a-c-k-s; is that correct?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. If it lies within your knowledge, is he still in the school system today—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; I think so.

Mr. KUNZIG. In New York?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Maurice Riedman—R-i-e-d-m-a-n?

Mr. FUNN. Yes. Maurice Riedman was a teacher in a boys' high school. He was not a member of the group either.

Mr. KUNZIG. The group to which you belonged?

Mrs. FUNN. The group to which I belonged.

But he came at times to lecture to the inner group on some matter of Marxism, Leninism.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now, these people you have mentioned, whether or not they belonged to your group, as I understand your testimony

today, you are stating that they were members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Of some other group?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know a Marcella Avnet—A-v-n-e-t?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. She was a teacher at Girls' High School, and she joined the group but later left because her husband established his residence in Baltimore and was a practicing lawyer down there, and she went there to live.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, are there any other members you wish to name of this particular group at this moment?

Mrs. FUNN. I don't think so. I don't recall any others.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Funn, to whom did you pay your dues, if you paid any?

Mrs. FUNN. You mean now—

It's all according to when—at what time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, take it up period by period.

Mrs. FUNN. All right.

When I was a member of the teacher group in Brooklyn, the dues were paid during the meeting to the financial secretary.

Mr. KUNZIG. How much did you have to pay?

Mrs. FUNN. We paid according to our salary—our yearly salary. It was then broken down on the monthly basis.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean if you got a higher salary, you had to pay more?

Mrs. FUNN. You paid more; that's right. If I recall correctly, I paid between a dollar and a half and \$2 a month. There was a scale.

Mr. KUNZIG. A regular scale?

Mrs. FUNN. A regular scale.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who set up that scale?

Mrs. FUNN. The Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, what other group—

Mrs. FUNN. Now—

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Who was the financial secretary of the group?

Mrs. FUNN. At one time it was Sarah Gilman. Those duties went around from year to year. There would be elections and a new person would be elected to the office, or to the many offices—put it that way.

Mr. KUNZIG. To whom else did you pay dues then?

Mrs. FUNN. Then, after I went out of the school system and was working in the organizations, I remember working in the office of the Negro Labor Victory Committee, and also later on the National Negro Congress, and some of them would come down from the section—when I say "come down," they would come down from 135th Street, where the section was at that time for Harlem—and I was working in Harlem—and they would come down and collect the dues and go on back again.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever get any specific accounting on these dues or where the money went?

Mrs. FUNN. No. You paid dues. Then there were extra assessments. It might be a fund drive for the continuation of the work

of the Communist Party. So, you paid on the fund drive, and that was—that went to the party to carry on their work; but as for any breakdown, like you would in business, of saying that so much was for this and so much was for that, and your profits so much and your losses are so much, no.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words, there was no real accounting of the funds; it was sort of kissed goodbye, so to speak?

Mrs. FUNN. As far as we were concerned; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, in 1943, as I recall your earlier testimony, you became interested in activities in Washington, D. C. I would like to direct your attention now to that. What position did you hold at that time when you went to Washington?

Mrs. FUNN. I was the legislative representative for the National Negro Congress.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain just a bit to the committee what the National Negro Congress was?

Mrs. FUNN. The National Negro Congress was an organization started about 1936, in some way similar to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, only their idea was that for any work against the injustices that Negroes suffered here in America—for any of that work, that should be done with our basis—with a basic membership among labor. So, the idea was to affiliate ourselves more with trade unions than with the groups to which the NAACP had been appealing at that time—and that is the middle-income group—so that a mass organization of tremendous membership will be built up of working people interested in eliminating the social, economic, and political difficulties—I mean inequalities of the Negro here in America.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you attend Communist Party meetings in Washington, D. C.?

Mrs. FUNN. I attended a few of those when I was in town.

Mr. KUNZIG. To your knowledge, were the individuals attending those meetings members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, I must repeat again—any of these meetings, Communist Party meetings, of a club or a group were attended only by members of the party. No outsiders were allowed into those meetings, and those that I attended of the group in Washington had to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now, you, yourself, you said, were a legislative representative?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is what is generally known, I believe, to the public as a lobbyist. Would that be correct?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, as a lobbyist, I presume you came in contact with other lobbyists.

Mrs. FUNN. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you come in contact—and I want you to think very seriously over this question—with any other legislative representatives or lobbyists whom you knew to be members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. I came in contact with a great number of legislative representatives, some whom I found later were members of the party because they met with me in the group, in the Communist Party group.

there in Washington. There were regular meetings of the legislative representatives—regular Communist Party meetings of the legislative representatives—in Washington.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. I want to get that straight.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean the Communist Party held meetings of Communist Party members who were also legislative representatives—

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). And they met as Communist Party members together?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, were they furthering the cause of the groups they were representing in the legislature or were they attempting to further the cause of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, I might say in all Communist Party meetings the basic idea was to give full attention and study to Marxism, Leninism, and furthering the cause of the revolution.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now, Mrs. Funn—

Mrs. FUNN. You see, come the revolution, some of them were going to be commissars of this, that, or the other thing. That's a quote.

Mr. VELDE. May I ask you, Mrs. Funn, if these people were registered as lobbyists—any of them?

Mrs. FUNN. No; I don't—at that time—this was—there was no law to that effect. This was back in 1943, 1944—

Mr. VELDE. I see.

Mrs. FUNN. 1945.

And they were the legislative representatives of their duly constituted organizations, whether it was the United Auto Workers or the Food and Tobacco Workers or the Maritime Union, of the International Longshoremen—longshoremen and warehousemen's union—those types of organizations, plus others like the National Negro Congress and National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

That is the way it was. There was no registration, but—not “but”—there was no registration.

Mr. KEARNEY. When was the National Negro Congress organized?

Mrs. FUNN. 1936. I don't know—see, I wasn't any part of it at that time; didn't come into the picture at all until after the summer of 1940, when a convention was held in Washington, D. C.

Mr. KEARNEY. Wasn't that organization labeled by the then Attorney General of the United States, Tom Clark, as being a subversive organization?

Mrs. FUNN. I don't think it was in the beginning. I don't think it was at the time. I mean, I'm not sure—1940—but subsequently it was one of those named; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one question there, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. You just said the basic objective was to further the cause of the revolution and that some of these people had the idea that from the revolution some of them would be commissars.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.



Mr. DOYLE. Do you mean that people living in 1943 claimed that the revolution, by force, would come so soon that in their lifetime they would become commissars?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, I tell you, when I said that—I said, it was a quote because, although I think it's a basic thing, it was said oftentimes in fun—"Come the revolution, so forth and so on will happen"—but I think underneath that there was something more basic in that—that there was an idea there would be an overthrow of our American tenets and that the Marxist-Leninist doctrines would then be adopted and put into operation.

Mr. DOYLE. And is that one of your ultimate conclusions based upon your long-time association and leadership in the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Well—

Mr. DOYLE. Is that one of your own conclusions, based upon your—

Mrs. FUNN. You mean—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Long membership—that they were believing and advocating there would be this overthrow of our constitutional form of government and that it would come?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, personally, I didn't see how it could come under the—the type of government that we have, if that's what you mean; but whether there may be an idea of this happening, that could be.

I don't know if we quite understand each other. Do you mean that it is my feeling that the revolution would come?

Mr. DOYLE. No.

Mrs. FUNN. No; it was not.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not asking you whether or not it was your belief that it would come, but I am asking you whether or not, from your long-time experience and leadership in the Communist Party, one of your own conclusions—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Growing out of that experience—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Is that the Communist Party in America advocated and believed that there would come a revolution?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, yes, because all of their literature speaks of socialism for America—and not necessarily a bloody revolution, but that there would be every means taken to bring about such a condition where socialism would take over America instead of the form of government that we have today.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, then, when you use the phrase "come the revolution, they would become commissars," was that in jest or really because it was basically part of their, shall I say, anticipated hopes?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, one can't say those things in jest for any great length of time without there being some basis in belief, I would say.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Funn, can you search your memory carefully and recall the names of those people who were legislative representatives of other groups with whom you met as Communists in Washington, D. C., during that period—I believe it was—from 1943 to 1946? Is that correct?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Well, I can—I think I can remember some of them. There was an Irvin Richter. I think he was with the—in fact, I know he is with the United Auto Workers.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that I-r-v-i-n R-i-c-h-t-e-r?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; because he was a part of that Communist Party group with whom I met in Washington.

Mr. KUNZIG. Continue.

Mr. FUNN. Herman Clott—C-l-o-t-t.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was his position?

Mrs. FUNN. I think he was with the United Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, CIO.

Mr. KUNZIG. A representative of the United Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers?

Mr. FUNN. That's right.

Harriet Bouslog—B-o-u-s-l-o-g. She was with the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union.

Mr. MOULDER. Is she an attorney?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. And is now in Honolulu?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Geraldine Shandros—S-h-a-n-d-r-o-s. She was with the American Communication Association.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Russell A. Nixon?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; I knew him. He was originally with the—I think he was originally with the CIO, but I know he joined the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America as their representative.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. He met with the group.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could you keep your voice up?

Mrs. FUNN. I'm sorry.

Mr. KUNZIG. I know it's difficult—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). But, if you will, speak as clearly as you can.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. I would like to ask you a question there. You said you met with the group. I think counsel's question was: Did you know Nixon as a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. That's the answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. I think, sir, it is already on the record that all of these people who met with this group, as I understand it—

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Were members of the party. Is that correct?

Mrs. FUNN. I tried to make that very clear—that no one who was not a member of the party could attend these specific meetings.

Mr. KUNZIG. So that any other names you mention from now on that met with you in the group you mean are members—

Mrs. FUNN. Are members.

Mr. KUNZIG. Or you know them as members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. As members of the Communist Party; that is correct.

Mr. VELDE. In what capacity was Mr. Nixon acting?

Mrs. FUNN. Legislative representative of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America.

Mr. KEARNEY. He still is, isn't he?

Mrs. FUNN. I don't know.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know any further names, Mrs. Funn? I will mention some to you—and think carefully—and if you knew these people definitely, state whether you knew them as members of the Communist Party or not.

Mrs. FUNN. Also the legislative representative of the Communist Party, Albert Blumberg.

Mr. KUNZIG. Of course, he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. He was a member of the Communist Party, but was also our guide.

Mr. VELDE. Did anyone else besides Mr. Nixon from the United Electrical Workers ever meet with you?

Mrs. FUNN. Not that I recall at the moment. I mean, it's been a long time ago. There have been—may have been some names that have gone by me, but I do remember—I do not at the present moment; I don't recall any.

Mr. VELDE. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Hoyt Haddock—H-o-y-t—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). H-a-d-d-o-c-k.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. Hoyt Haddock met with us, and he was associated with the National Maritime Union, was the—I think it was one of the marine unions.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Did you know a Seth Levine—S-e-t-h L-e-v-i-n-e?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; I knew Seth Levine. I'm not sure which one of the groups he was—I mean which union he represented, but he was one of those who met with us.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Thomas Richardson, vice president of the UPWA?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did he meet with your group—

Mrs. FUNN. He me with—

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). As a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. He met with the group as a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, from the Washington Industrial Union Council—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Did you know a Henry Beitscher—B-e-i-t-s-c-h-e-r?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. He met with the group maybe once or twice, but also I would see him with William Taylor from time to time—William Taylor being the organizer of the Communist Party in Washington, D. C.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Bob Sherman—S-h-e-r-m-a-n?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. In what capacity?

Mrs. FUNN. He was also a legislative representative, or—no; wait a minute; no—I think he was attached to the Washington Industrial Union Council, if I recall correctly, or the United Public Workers, and they all had representatives at the Washington Industrial Union Council.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know an Elizabeth Sasuly?

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Pardon me.

Mr. VELDE. Did you know Mr. Sherman as a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. I will assume from now on all of these people you are naming you knew as members of the Communist Party.

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. You will not mention any names except those who were members and who you knew to be members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know an Elizabeth Sasuly?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. Elizabeth Sasuly, legislative representative of the Food and Tobacco Workers, and she met with the group, that is, the Communist Party group in Washington.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, there was an editor of the CIO News by the name of Len De Caux—D-e-C-a-u-x. Did you know him?

Mrs. FUNN. He also met with the Communist Party group.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know an Elizabeth Searle—S-e-a-r-l-e?

Mrs. FUNN. I knew Elizabeth Searle as executive secretary or organizer of the Communist Party in Washington, D. C., and she came up to my office several times to see me.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was that the same group that James Branca—B-r-a-n-c-a—

Mrs. FUNN. Well, you see—

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Was a member of?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; to answer your question, yes. They were secretaries at different times. If one secretary went into the Army—I mean a man—then somebody else was elected to take his place, so that Elizabeth Searle was one, or I should say—it was the other way around—James Branca was the organizer, the organizational secretary, and he left and Elizabeth Searle took his place, and somewhere in between there was William Taylor as the organizational secretary of the Communist Party in Washington.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a woman from the Anti-Poll Tax Committee by the name of Sarah Hartman D-'-A-v-i-l-a?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; I did. I knew her, and she also met with the Communist Party group in Washington.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you pronounce that?

Mrs. FUNN. D'Avila, I guess.

Mr. KUNZIG. D'Avila.

Mrs. FUNN. We knew her mostly as Sarah Hartman.

Mr. KUNZIG. Sarah Hartman?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now, could you tell the committee what this group of legislative representatives that you've just mentioned dis-

cussed at the meetings—what sort of things were taken up at the Communist Party meetings?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. At the Communist Party meetings there were several things taken up. There might be somebody assigned to give a—to lead a theoretical discussion on Marxism, Leninism, or take up some fact that had been published in the newspapers and discuss that from the Marxist-Leninist angle. Further than that, also the matters of legislation were taken up and discussed fully—whether it was antipoll tax or fair employment practices, or antilynch law, or Federal aid to education. Whatever it was at the time would be discussed fully and many times we even took assignments at that meeting to see certain of the Congressmen to get their help, either in—well, those that I've named—it was for help in the passage of those bills.

Mr. KUNZIG. Just one more question at this point I would like to ask: As to these people who met together, whether they were from the United Auto Workers, or whatever group they might be officially representing, is it correct that their meeting in this Communist Party group was to further the work of the Communist Party rather than the United Auto Workers, shall we say?

Mrs. FUNN. I would say yes, or they wouldn't have needed that meeting. We could have met any time up on the Hill.

Mr. SCHERER. May I just ask one question in connection with that?

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. SCHERER. Mrs. Funn, were the leaders of the Communist Party genuinely and sincerely interested in the problems of minority groups, or did these leaders just display this interest to obtain converts to the Communist cause?

Mrs. FUNN. You know, the cause—I'll answer you, sir—the cause of the Negro is a very touching one and one on which a lot needs to be done yet, and my feeling and conclusion is that the Communist Party took this great need that Negroes in America feel as a basis for exploitation of their wants, desires, and the things that they were working for, which were not for complete justice and equality for the Negro but it lends itself beautifully to an emotional tieup, and you can say, "Well, if this is the organization that's going to do this, therefore, this is the organization with which I want to affiliate myself."

Mr. SCHERER. Well, from what you say—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). The answer to my question would necessarily be yes, would it not?

Shall I repeat that question?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes, please.

Mr. SCHERER. I would like to get this in the record. I wrote it out here.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Were the leaders of the Communist conspiracy genuinely and sincerely interested in the problems of minority groups, or did these leaders just display an interest in these problems to obtain converts to the Communist cause?

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mr. Scherer—

Mrs. FUNN. The first part of your question—the answer is "No"; and to the second part of your question, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. SCHERER. Now, let me ask just one more question: Did not the Communist leaders often agitate racial and minority grievances in order to gain converts to communism?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, following up those questions, may I ask—

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). To your knowledge, since 1946, which I understand is the last year you were at Washington—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). In the capacity of national legislative representative for the National Negro Congress, has there been any change in the line of the Communist Party so far as their attitude toward the American Negro is concerned from that which you testified to?

Mrs. FUNN. I don't think so. I think they will take every opportunity today or tomorrow, any time, to gather forces around them for their support. If they find something on which—to which they can latch and then bring in Negro converts, they will do so. I don't think that the tactic has changed at all, and I'm sorry to say that many times they have been very successful in getting numbers of Negro followers due to the fact they have been exploiting the condition of the Negro.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. I believe at this point we can declare a 10-minute recess.

(Whereupon, at 3:28 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 3:38 p. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 3:38 p. m., the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Bernard W. Kearney, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr. (appearance noted in transcript).)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Funn, it is my understanding that the National Negro Congress has now folded up; is that correct?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. So far as you know, when did that take place?

Mrs. FUNN. As far as I know, I think about the middle of 1947; perhaps it was the spring of 1947, or early summer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was that amalgamated into any other group?

Mrs. FUNN. Again, as far as I know, I think everything was turned over to the Civil Rights Congress.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you tell the committee where the Negro Commission of the Communist Party fits into this picture?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, the Negro Commission fits in very definitely. I recall meeting with the Negro Commission of the Communist Party back while I was still a member of the staff of the National Negro Congress, and certain matters of policy for future action came up at the Negro Commission. I mean matters of policy and action in connection with the National Negro Congress would come up for consideration and discussion at the Negro Commission of the Com-

unist Party, which met on East 12th Street at the Communist Party headquarters.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who was the president of the National Negro Congress?

Mrs. FUNN. Max Yergan was the president.

Mr. KUNZIG. At what time was that?

Mrs. FUNN. He took over from A. Philip Randolph in 1940 at the convention held in Washington in the Labor Building.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that M-a-x Y-e-r-g-a-n?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Max Yergan as a party member?

Mrs. FUNN. I say yes; I knew him as a party member.

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you name any other officers of the National Negro Congress at the time you were active in it?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. Thelma Dale at one time was the executive secretary. Then Everett Strong was the executive secretary. Revels Cayton became the executive secretary—in fact, was the executive secretary—in 1940.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you spell that?

Mrs. FUNN. R-e-v-e-l-s C-a-y-t-o-n.

Mr. KUNZIG. Continue.

Mrs. FUNN. Ferdinand C. Smith, formerly of the National Maritime Union, was the treasurer.

Mr. VELDE. Mrs. Funn, you have mentioned Revels Cayton.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know where he is located at the present time?

Mrs. FUNN. No; I don't.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know where he was at that time?

Mrs. FUNN. He was brought here from California to take over the executive secretaryship of the National Negro Congress. At the time he came—I mean, prior to his coming here he had been a part of the Maritime Union on the west coast—been an officer, I guess.

Mr. KUNZIG. I believe you mentioned Bill Taylor. In what capacity did you know him?

Mrs. FUNN. I knew him as the organizer for the Communist Party in Washington, D. C.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Rob Hall—H-a-l-l?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; I knew him as a correspondent for the Daily Worker, stationed—he was stationed in Washington.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Phil Frankfeld—F-r-a-n-k-e-l-d?

Mrs. FUNN. I knew that name, and it seems to me during the time that I was there—I mean, I knew him as a member of the Baltimore Communist Party. I think any time I was there he was the organizer out of Baltimore.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you have mentioned Albert Blumberg as the Communist Party legislative representative in Washington, D. C.—

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Is that correct?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, can you tell the committee anything about his activities in connection with whether he could or could not get things done in his use of you people?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. Albert Blumberg, first of all, was the ideological head of the legislative group who were members of the Communist

Party, and he met with us in the Communist Party meetings in Washington. Further than that, if he found it necessary, he would assign certain of the legislative representatives who were Communists to see certain Congressmen to whom he couldn't go because he wouldn't get an audience with the Congressmen or Senators, so that we would then do the job of lobbying in place of him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, would you say that these legislative representatives were Communists with or without the knowledge of the organizations with which they were affiliated or which they allegedly represented?

Mrs. FUNN. I would say in some instances it was without the knowledge, and probably in some instances it was with.

Maybe I——

Mr. VELDE. Well, could we——

Mrs. FUNN. That isn't——

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Could we be a little bit more specific?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. By "knowledge of the organizations," are you referring to the membership of the organization, or the greater majority?

Mr. KUNZIG. What I am trying to ascertain, Mrs. Funn, is whether or not, in your opinion—of course, this can only lie within your knowledge—did you feel that the legislative representative, let's say, of the National Maritime Union, whatever it might have been, was known to be a Communist among the leaders of his own union, group, or whether the Communist membership was a secret thing?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, I would say—I want to state this: I would say it was a secret thing because I can't imagine Joe Curran having, if he knew, the Communists there as the representatives of his union, say it was the Maritime Union, or the United Auto Workers—that the head of that would have had a Communist, had they known it, as their legislative representative.

Mr. KUNZIG. What about your own case? Did the National Negro Congress leaders know you were a member of the party?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, we were all members. There wasn't——

Mr. CLARDY. Well, was it necessary that it be kept absolutely secret if they were to do anything good at all with any Members of Congress?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. In this way the Communist Party was able to have an influence far beyond its own weight in the Communist Party——

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). And was able to exert influence through other groups?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you personally know Mr. Curran and the head of the United Auto Workers?

Mrs. FUNN. I, personally, knew Mr. Curran, head of the National Maritime Union. I don't or didn't know the head of the United Auto Workers.

Mr. DOYLE. The reason I ask you that is because of your observation—that you speak of them as knowing——



Mrs. FUNN. No; I can't—the type of practices that Mr. Curran has always espoused would not allow for Communists to be doing this important work there, if he had known.

Mr. DOYLE. How about the other—the head of the auto workers?

Mrs. FUNN. You see, I speak for some of those, like the Maritime Union—I can speak for that because it was here in New York City. Now, the United Auto Workers—their main base is in Detroit. The Food and Tobacco Workers—I don't know where their main base is, but I am only speaking for the one, as I say, I knew here in New York City.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Mrs. Funn, you have mentioned the names of legislative representatives that you knew to be members of the Communist Party. Would you mention the names of any other people that you knew as members of the party and met with in Washington, D. C., from 1943 to 1946 when you were there as a legislative representative?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, there are several people I have here. There's Shirley Taylor. She was the wife of William Taylor, organizer for the Communist Party in Washington, D. C.

There is Rose Clinton, who worked for the Cafeteria Workers, at that time CIO, and also sold the Daily Worker regularly on Sundays, and used to talk at times about the number of people she had on contact to become members of the party.

There was Jack Zucker, who was some officer in the Furniture Workers' Union. He was stationed there, or living there, in Washington, and I had met with Jack Zucker and William Taylor out at Zucker's home.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that the Zucker that is now with the Civil Rights Congress in Philadelphia?

Mrs. FUNN. It may be. I wouldn't know unless I saw him.

Mr. VELDE. Have you told where these meetings of these legislative representatives were held?

Mrs. FUNN. They were held at the homes of different members. One meeting was held at my house; another meeting was held at Clott's house; another meeting was held at Gerry Shandros' house, and so it went, around to some of the homes.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know how the meetings were called or how the membership was notified of a particular meeting?

Mrs. FUNN. It was one of those round-robin things. Whoever had gotten the word from Blumberg would then contact one person; you contact the next one, and so it would go, until everybody knew—contacted personally or by telephone.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you continue with any others you recall from your period of time in Washington, D. C.?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Martin Chancey and Casey Gurewitz were known Communists in Washington, and they came up to my office several times to get petitions or some throwaways that we had to have distributed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Funn, would you carefully and slowly spell those names?

Mrs. FUNN. Martin Chancey—C-h-a-n-c-e-y.

Casey Gurewitz—G-u-r-e-w-i-t-z.

Mr. KUNZIG. Continue.

Mrs. FUNN. Virgil Akeson—V-i-r-g-i-l A-k-e-s-o-n. He was also a legislative representative, whom I have not included in that list.

Mr. KUNZIG. With what group—

Mrs. FUNN. With—

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). If you remember?

Mrs. FUNN. Gee, I am not sure.

Mr. KUNZIG. You are not sure, but you knew him to be a legislative representative?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Continue.

Mrs. FUNN. Calvin Cousins—C-o-u-s-i-n-s—a known Communist in Washington, working with the laundry workers, I think, and he was another one who would distribute leaflets, and so forth, if one needed him.

Al Lannon—L-a-n-n-o-n. For a time he was head of the Baltimore-Washington Communist Party, with their headquarters in Washington. I had met Al Lannon prior to that here in New York as a waterfront organizer. First of all, I think he was in the NMU, CIO, but he left and became a waterfront organizer for the Communist Party. He was originally a seaman, and then he had some job with the NMU, and he left to become a Communist Party waterfront organizer.

William Johnson, a known Communist in Washington, head of the cooks' union there at the time I was there and, as I recall, that was an A. F. of L. union.

Doxey Wilkerson—

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell that?

Mrs. FUNN. D-o-x-e-y W-i-l-k-e-r-s-o-n, formerly a professor at Howard University, who became an open member of the Communist Party, and was also a member of the executive board of the National Negro Congress.

Mr. DOYLE. What do you mean by an open member?

Mrs. FUNN. I mean just this: There was a large dinner meeting given in Washington, at which time Dr. Wilkerson got up and announced that he was a member of the Communist Party of the United States and would function in that capacity.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. And there were other people there—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Other than Communists—present at that particular dinner?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. They had a large group because he was well known and well liked, and they all came to honor him at the time, and it was at that time, though, that the bombshell, you might say, fell and he made his announcement.

Dorothy Blumberg was the wife of Al Blumberg, and I saw her several times in the Baltimore office of the Communist Party. She worked there and functioned out of that office.

Gertrude Evans was a secretary for the Industrial Union Council in Washington, D. C., and she didn't meet with our group; but several times she came up to my office and asked to meet Bill Taylor there.

Marie Richardson, the executive secretary of the Washington Council of the National Negro Congress, also known to be a party member.

Henry Thomas, an officer in a construction union, and he met regularly—met from time to time, I should say, with Bill Taylor when he came up to the office. They sort of used that maybe as the off-limit grounds where some one would drop in and the other person would drop in, and the first thing you knew they were having a meeting together.

William Taylor I have mentioned.

Art Shields, of course, the Daily Worker correspondent in Washington for a while, too.

Mary Willoughby, who worked in the office of the A. F. of L. cooks' union, of which William Johnson was the head, and she was alleged to be a Communist Party member. When I say that, I say it this way—because, you know, talk would go around, "she is a member," or "she is not a member." So, she was alleged to be.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know her to be a member?

Mrs. FUNN. Not that I ever saw her at a Communist Party meeting; no. I wouldn't have, anyway.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean, however, everybody in the know treated her as a member?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Gloria Johnson. I understand her name became Hollis later. She worked in my office as an assistant secretary there, and I know that they were working on her to become a member, and she—I don't know whether she subsequently became one.

Mr. DOYLE. In your office in Washington?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Continue, if there are any others.

Mrs. FUNN. Oh, I left one out here—Lem Belton—B-e-l-t-o-n. He was known as a Communist Party member there in Washington. He worked openly as one.

And Maurice Braverman, an attorney in Baltimore, whom I saw at an executive meeting of the Baltimore-Washington Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you spell Braverman?

Mrs. FUNN. B-r-a-v-e-r-m-a-n—and I think the first name is Maurice.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that all that you recall at the present time?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; that is all I recall. I wrote them down.

Mr. KUNZIG. For what reason did you return to New York at the end of your stay in Washington? Why did you leave Washington?

Mrs. FUNN. I left Washington because—one thing—I was through with—I was through with the whole setup of the Communist Party. I had found out that my original reason for joining the Communist Party, which I thought was a good one, and became a leader in a mass organization that was an arm of the Communist Party—I got mixed up in my statement there, but, anyway, I had joined and thought I was going on the right path for economic and social and political freedom for the Negro. Working in the organization, I found that we were really puppets of the Communist Party, and that there was truly no interest in furthering Negro rights. Therefore, I was no longer interested or wanted to be any part of it. So, I came back to New York and decided to try to get my old job.

In fact, coming back to New York—before I came back to New York, in September of 1946, I wrote to Dr. Greenberg of the Board of Education and asked for reinstatement into the school system of New York

City, and later on I heard that I would be allowed to be reinstated since the time limit on retirements had been raised to 5 years and I had only been out 4. So, back I came and entered the school system again.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you in Detroit at all at that point?

Mrs. FUNN. I was in Detroit in May—maybe the end of April and beginning of—and through May of 1946. The occasion was a convention called by the National Negro Congress in Detroit. That was supposedly to be a real campaign, and since the establishment of the United Nations and the Human Rights Commission within it—it was a decision that there might be an appeal made to that Human Rights Commission of the United Nations for the relief of Negroes' injustices.

It sounded wonderful. I was very much interested, but I found that as other things had been done, so this was planned and with no idea of carrying through or using the facilities that were available through the United Nations and through our own Government to further the cause of the Negro. That was one of these things that made a headline and would in its way go forward for the moment, and then dropped completely.

There was always an appeal, always great cleverness, in thinking up something that would be appealing—and I say cleverness, thinking the cleverness among the Communists working within the organization and those from whom they got their rules and actions, who were members of the national Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, isn't it a fact, Mrs. Funn, that the Communist Party often agitated racial grievances and tensions purposely?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. And that was part of the program, as you found it to be?

Mrs. FUNN. As I found it to be, that was part of the program, because it couldn't help be otherwise. When you came down to actualities of doing the correct thing about it, carrying through, through the natural channels established, that didn't happen. You see, then that was sloughed off and something else would be picked up to be taken up at the moment.

I found great insincerity. I found untruths. I found that there was no one thing that I could latch onto as something that the Communist Party was sincere about, other than socialism for America and doing away with the irregular democratic government that had been established here for years and years and years.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, didn't the program generally set minorities against majorities and often minorities even against minorities when it suited the Communist program?

Mrs. FUNN. I would say that has happened. I can't at the moment think of an instance, but I know that it has happened; yes—and minorities makes a wonderful stepping-off point, you know.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, at one time wasn't it felt the Communist Party was opposed to anti-Semitism; isn't that right?

Mrs. FUNN. Oh, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. At one time?

Mrs. FUNN. Oh, yes.

I recall at the school I attended we had Pop Mindel<sup>1</sup> come over one night to give the whole picture on what was termed the Jewish ques-

<sup>1</sup> Correct name J. Mindel.

tion and the great desire for the freedom of the Jews, and against anti-Semitism.

Mr. SCHIERER. Now, hasn't that picture changed, though, today? Isn't it a fact that the Communist Party is anti-Semitic today?

Mrs. FUNN. I would say that Russia is anti-Semitic, and, more than likely, if they're following the same pattern that they have been following all of these years, they are also anti-Semitic.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. I have no contact—that's right: the Communist Party.

I have no contact with the Communist Party. I could not know what their plans are, but—

Mr. SCHIERER. Well, we have had testimony from persons in the last 3 months, from prominent Jews, who have testified before this committee, that the Communist Party today was anti-Semitic and is as anti-Semitic as Hitler ever was.

Mrs. FUNN. May I say this: I agree in your thoughts, as far as that goes, and may I also say that it would naturally follow that if Russia is anti-Semitic the Communist Party, United States of America, is anti-Semitic.

Mr. DOYLE. Why would that be true?

Mr. FUNN. I recall up at the State school that the Hitler-Stalin pact came out while we were there—just a little example. Well, the leader was stunned. We sat there and we read the paper, and he said, "Now, just go among yourselves and talk a little bit and read the paper. I will be back."

So, he went upstairs to his room, and I guess he mulled this thing over for a couple of hours, came down, and told us we would have a session after lunch. We went into the session, and, in very short words, the end of his remarks added up to: "If Stalin does it, it's right."

So, the same thing holds here. If Russia does it, then it's right—and whatever they practice, then the Communist Party here will practice.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean the Communist Party in the United States would practice whatever they are ordered to practice from Moscow?

Mrs. FUNN. That's my conclusion, my only conclusion, from my experience, as I told you, about this Hitler-Stalin pact, as Moreau made the statement, "If Stalin does it, it is right."

Mr. DOYLE. A minute ago you said you found out, "We were really only puppets of the Communist Party, and there was truly no interest in furthering Negro rights."

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. That was your exact language.

What group was it that was a puppet of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. The National Negro Congress.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, do you mean all the time of its existence it was really the Communist Party in America speaking through the National Negro Congress?

Mrs. FUNN. I am forced to say "Yes"—

Mr. DOYLE. Well—

Mrs. FUNN. And I say that because of the tie-up with several of those who were the leaders of the National Negro Congress, including myself.

Mr. DOYLE. I will ask this question, then, Mr. Chairman: Do you now know of any organization or committee that is organized whose main objective is the interests of the Negro in America which, to your knowledge, is also Communist controlled?

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney left the hearing room at this point.)

Mrs. FUNN. I don't—I haven't had any contact with any such groups, but if the Civil Rights Congress is still in existence, then I would say that is one of them, having taken over the duties of the National Negro Congress.

I also heard and read about the formation of some type of labor council in Harlem and, from the roster of names, I would say that they are perhaps trying to—duplicating, trying in their way, to duplicate the work of the National Negro Congress and of this whole—taking over the field of Negro rights and exploiting it.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand that sometime ago—I mean from your testimony—some months ago—there was a proposal to use the Human Rights—

Mrs. FUNN. Commission.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Commission—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Of the United Nations as a medium through which the American Negro would more definitely have his rights furthered, but that you discovered there was really no intention by the Communist leaders in America to use that commission, although they announced they were going to?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

May I say this: Out of the convention of the National Negro Congress in Detroit in June, May and June of 1946, came a petition to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights from the National Negro Congress convention and naturally, anything of that kind, you would expect that there would be further activity of seeing members of the commission, of also seeing the President of the United States, of going through all channels that are regularly constituted to see what can be done. I take now as a publicity stunt of the moment and a further show of supposed interest in Negro grievances. After that, nothing more came of it.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you say, Witness, the Communists are not really interested in solving these problems; they want them as rallying points?

Mrs. FUNN. They're wonderful rallying points and that's what they've been used as; but as for sincere solution, no.

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like to return just briefly to this State school of the Communist Party which you said you attended.

Recently the Subversive Activities Control Board in Washington, D. C., handed down its order and opinion on the Communist Party of the United States of America. Reading from page 181 of that report, briefly it states:

Respondent—

meaning the Communist Party—

schools have been conducted under varying degrees of secrecy. During periods of strict secrecy, including the periods of 1939 to 1941, 1948 to 1950, extraordinary precautions were taken to conceal the existence of these schools and the names of the trusted party members who were selected to attend them. Students at

party schools have carried out instructions to observe stringent concealment regulations in order to preserve the secrecy shrouding the operation of these schools.

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Does that fit in with your experience?

Mrs. FUNN. Exactly; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. You would—

Mrs. FUNN. We were not even allowed to receive mail, as far as that goes. We couldn't go to the movies.

Kingston was about 10 or 12, maybe 15 miles away. I remember we once did go to the movies, but we went as a group in a truck, and we were taken into the city of Kingston and we went to the movies, and in the end we got a soda and we got on the truck and back we went to the farm.

There was one man there who would go and pick up the newspapers, and I guess their mail, if they had a box there, or maybe Bergman had a box that some of them used; but I know generally speaking you were allowed no mail. I was not allowed to tell anyone where I was, and that's the way it was carried on.

I even recall that a few of us walked down the road one night and got a glass of beer and came back, and we were severely disciplined for it.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, why? What was so secret about it?

Mrs. FUNN. It was a Communist Party State school, to which you had been sent, and you are teachers in New York City, and you're not supposed to know; and then also the possibility of someone else finding out about it, I guess; and also it is—the subjects you were going to take up there—they didn't want known on the outside, I suppose, because it was very, very secret.

Mr. DOYLE. I was going to ask—perhaps you will—what subjects were taught—

Mr. KUNZIG. Go right ahead, sir.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). In the school?

What was wrong about the subjects you were taught at this secret Communist Party school? What was it you were being taught?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, the basic—

Mr. DOYLE. Was it a violation of the law?

Mrs. FUNN. The basic text was Marxism, Leninism. Then you had the Manual of Organization by Peters. There was a monthly magazine that used to come out at that time—they since stopped publishing it—called the Communist International. There were several small pamphlets, maybe of 10 or 12 pages, on the Negro question, the Jewish question. There was State and Revolution. That's another pamphlet that they got out.

You see, you were specially selected to learn as much as you could about Marxism and Leninism at that school and then carry it on into your daily living at the conclusion of your time there.

Mr. SCHERER. Including the classroom, if you were a teacher?

Mrs. FUNN. If you were a teacher—and we were all teachers.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean everybody attending this school were teachers?

Mrs. FUNN. Except about three.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were they all from New York?

Mrs. FUNN. There were 30 people there and 27—approximately 27—were teachers. About three were nonteachers.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were they all from New York City?

Mrs. FUNN. All from New York City; yes.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. DOYLE. Did they have more than one group during the season, or was it just one?

Mrs. FUNN. No; there were two groups working—I mean going on at the same time. About 25 miles away from us was another school called the National School, and at that school all the people attending came from different sections of the country. Our school was limited to teachers of New York City.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand you said you were to keep your identification with the Communist Party secret and that the schoolteacher was not to reveal that to anyone, but you also testified that you were to carry into your daily life what you had learned at that school. My question was: Were you to do it in the classroom—

Mrs. FUNN. No.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Subtly, perhaps?

Mrs. FUNN. I want to—I want to answer it this way, if I may: No one stood up there and said, "Now, this is what you are to teach in the classroom."

Mr. SCHERER. I understand.

Mrs. FUNN. But, on the other hand, you couldn't possibly be open to all of this propaganda at the time, believing in—believing that they were doing something that was really for the good of all, as well as for any group, without slanting your work in the classroom; and I'm sure that I did, as well as others.

Mr. CLARDY. It colored your thinking?

Mrs. FUNN. It colored your thinking completely, and I can look back now and think of some of my history classes. Although it was to 12- and 13-year-olds, I'm sure that I slanted it in line with Communist Party doctrine.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, I can't remember the exact quote from some of the things you studied, but didn't you or weren't you taught at this school that eventually you must indoctrinate the school children of this country? Wasn't there a course in the method of indoctrination?

Mrs. FUNN. Not there.

Mr. SCHERER. Not at that school?

Mrs. FUNN. Not there; no. No; it was more for our indoctrination. I would say, and then from that we could carry on.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, weren't you taught as part of the Marxist doctrine that the party wanted to indoctrinate school teachers because they occupied a peculiarly important position in the Nation, that they were in the best position of all to train the young mind in the Communist direction?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, whether that was inferred or not—it wasn't actually said, but actions carry out their idea of recruiting schoolteachers, because I know that there would come a time of recruitment each year and they would say, "How many contacts do you have?"



And they were always trying to widen the bases of schoolteachers in the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, for instance, how many contacts would you have?

Mrs. FUNN. I had none, because—although I was a teacher, I never recruited anyone in the party—

Mr. DOYLE. Why?

Mrs. FUNN (continuing). Thank God.

Mr. DOYLE. Why didn't you? Others did.

Mrs. FUNN. Well, I tell you why: For the reason that I started working with the National Negro Congress. So, my activity was of a different kind from some of the other teacher members of the group to which I belonged. Whereas they might be visiting, going around, seeing some of these people with whom they were in contact, I, on the other hand, was carrying on the program of the National Negro Congress and had my afternoons and evenings filled up with that.

As I say, thank God I didn't.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yesterday, Mrs. Funn, throughout the Sunday newspapers of the United States of America there was an article entitled "I was a Communist Teacher," by Bella Dodd. Perhaps you saw it. I would like to take just a short excerpt from it and get your viewpoint and opinion on what Bella Dodd says. She said:

There was not, and I presume there still isn't, any standard plan for teaching communism in American schools. Any teacher who is a member of the party or a close sympathizer knows the effect he or she wants to achieve. In various subtle ways students are led to believe that everything communistic is admirable and everything democracy stands for is dogmatic, illogical or outmoded.

The American Communists did not need to evolve any new educational theories. They injected themselves into the campaign to develop progressive education and sometimes pushed it to ridiculous extremes to make it conform to a program of preparing American youth for acceptance of a Communist regime.

They stressed the approach that there is no absolute truth and that the difference between right and wrong is relative. They placed emphasis on development of an open mind.

The Communists were ready with an all-inclusive philosophy to chew on. They tried to take advantage of any weakness they could find in our educational system.

Does that fit with your experiences?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; I agree with that.

Mr. KUNZIG. You would confirm what was said in that article?

Mrs. FUNN. I would.

Mr. CLARDY. May I add something on that point?

I found the thing I had in mind when I was asking you a question a moment ago. Back in May 1937, the theoretical magazine of the Communist Party called *The Communist* had this to say, and I would like to have you pay attention to what I am reading here and see if this fits in. Here is a quote:

A people's movement around the schools can thus transform the classroom popular forums for progressive social action ultimately into forums for the revolution.

Now, does that have a familiar sound to you as something that may have been brought to your attention at some time during this school or at some time during your experience as a Communist?

Mrs. FUNN. No; it doesn't, but the thought was still there in it.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, it went on to say something like this:

Communist teachers are, therefore, faced with a tremendous social responsibility. They must take advantage of their positions without exposing themselves.

Only when teachers have really mastered Marxism, Leninism, will they be able skillfully to inject it into their teaching at the least risk of exposure.

Mrs. FUNN. That sounds very familiar.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, that comes from the same magazine——

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Or same publication of The Communist published as far back as 1937——

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. And even earlier than that.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this: I noticed you, Mrs. Funn, the witness, said this:

Matters of legislation were taken up and discussed fully many times. We took assignments to see certain Congressmen to get help for the passage of certain bills. Blumberg would not be able to get an audience. So we were assigned.

Now, we on this committee are all Members of Congress, and I think it is, therefore, rather important that we get what information we can of how we are being lobbied by Communists in Washington.

Mrs. FUNN. Well——

Mr. DOYLE. We certainly were, according to your testimony, while you were there.

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. To what extent does that go on, or to what extent did it go on at least during the time you were there?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, we were up there practically every day, and certainly when a special issue came up we all descended upon the halls of Congress and tried to get audiences with the many Congressmen.

I don't know if you were there then, or maybe——

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I have been there since 1945.

Mrs. FUNN. Well, no, then. See, I was about leaving that particular phase, working up on this convention to be held the following years; but that was very true.

Now, I don't know to what extent you are being put upon today. I have no way of knowing.

However, I would hate for Congressmen to feel that they can't possibly give audiences to any—what you call now lobbyists for fear of their being Communists, because I think there's so much that can be done in that field, of the legislative representative field, and in aid to Congressmen.

But I have no way of saying, you know, what is in existence today.

Mr. DOYLE. Assuming that much or a great deal of what was going on when you were a party to it still continues in the way of lobbying us Members of Congress by persons who are undisclosed Communists, as far as Congressmen are concerned, how could we get at it to discover who they are?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, I——

Mr. DOYLE. Is there any way we could identify those unregistered members of the Communist Party who were or are lobbying us as Communists rather than representing their own organizations primarily?

Mrs. FUNN. I—you're putting me—you're asking a question to which I have no answer. The only thing I could say is that anyone who is sympathetic and sees the right of aiding this committee and also working with the Congressmen—if they were in a position to know, then that might be the person, or the possibility of their—I'm sure each person, each lobbyist, today is thoroughly investigated. I don't know.

Mr. CLARDY. I don't think you need worry about their coming to see the members of this committee, anyway.

Mr. VELDE. I want to ask you one question, Mrs. Funn.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. I believe from the best estimate that we have been able to get there were about 75,000 members of the Communist Party during the time you were in Washington as a lobbyist or legislative representative. Wouldn't you say with the percentage of members representing different organizations, as well as the Communist Party, of your profession down there, that they had a pretty good ratio compared to the lobbying influence of other legitimate organizations, if you understand what I mean?

Mrs. FUNN. In other words, you mean—

Mr. VELDE. That the Communist Party had a pretty good lobby in Washington during—

Mrs. FUNN. They had a terrific lobby in Washington and the possibility of reaching far more than any of the other organizations would. After all, if you have 10 or 12 people representing thousands, because legislative representatives there would go back to the parent groups, to the many locals, to the councils of the mass organizations in the communities, so that their influence was far greater than would be the influence of, say, one person outside of this Communist Party group—yes; far greater.

Mr. VELDE. And it was a hidden lobby, so to speak, was it not, because they covered up by representing other organizations, covered up their Communist Party membership, where actually they were lobbying for the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you obtain your appointment as a legislative representative as a result of being a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes; yes.

Mr. MOULDER. It was through the party that you—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. My name was suggested by the party, and then Edward Strong, the executive secretary of the NNC, asked me to come in and see them, which I did; and there's no doubt of it—it was through the Communist Party, because a number—not a number—a couple of the officers of the Communist Party here in New York City also spoke to me about it and said they thought it would be a mighty fine idea if I accepted their offer.

Mr. MOULDER. Now, you have made reference to the secret meetings, or the meetings in Washington and elsewhere, where no one was admitted except a member of the Communist Party. How did you identify yourself to gain admission or how would any other person identify himself to gain admission?

Mrs. FUNN. Well, there was one—as far as I'm concerned, what had happened was the Communist Party of Baltimore-District of Columbia had been alerted to my coming, that I would be there, and, therefore, they would—they were to contact me and aid me in any way the people down there saw fit.

Mr. MOULDER. In the course of your testimony you made reference to recognizing active members of the Communist Party in the audience, in this courtroom, today.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you identify them by name?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, who are they?

Mrs. FUNN. Who are here today?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mrs. FUNN. Now, those who I saw—there may be more, but those that I saw—excuse me.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, I will withdraw the question.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. No.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

(No response.)

Mr. SCHERER.

(No response.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I have a question I always try to get time to ask and remember to ask.

I call your attention to Public Law 601, which was passed in the 79th Congress in 1945.

I am not sure whether you have ever read that provision, have you, under which this committee operates?

Mrs. FUNN. No; I haven't, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. It is very brief, and I wish to read you just one paragraph and ask your help along a certain line.

This law says:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of the extent, the character, the objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of government as guaranteed by our Constitution—

I call your particular attention to this last phrase—

and all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in the necessary remedial legislation.

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing to read).

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House or to the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session, the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Now, that is all of the statute under which this committee operates which I will take time to read; but, of course, it is a permanent, standing committee of Congress and I will ask you whether or not, in your wide experience, you have any recommendation to make to this committee in the field of its considering any remedial legislation.

Have you any recommendation to make as to its processes or procedures which may enter the field of remedial legislation?

Have you any such—

Mrs. FUNN. I have three recommendations.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I didn't know you were going to give us any, because I hadn't asked you previously—

Mrs. FUNN. No; you didn't.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). But I was hoping you were.

Mrs. FUNN. I'll tell you why I have three recommendations, because I thought them over very seriously after hearing the question asked of the previous witness this morning.

Mr. DOYLE. That is the question I asked this morning.

Mrs. FUNN. I imagine you did. I think that is what I heard you say—"any recommendations." I couldn't get it all, but it was the idea of recommendations to the committee—

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

Mrs. FUNN. I have three, since you gentlemen are in the legislative field and have the ability to influence your fellow Congressmen:

One is to back up Attorney General Brownell's stand on equal educational facilities for all Americans—and I think such legislation can be probably sponsored by you.

I think further that a law giving the people of the city of Washington the right to vote will eliminate discrimination and the many injustices against Negroes, for which they have a just grievance today in our National Capital.

Mr. CLARDY. You are talking about voting in local elections there, I take it.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes. I know they go out of the State to vote in national elections, but I mean voting in local elections which then gives them the possibility of doing away with some of the grievances that the Washington Negro resident has and still has.

And, further, that there be an FEPC fashioned on the New York State FEPC, whereby we have a State commission against discrimination that is not a punitive committee but is an educational committee and has had tremendous success in breaking down employment practices because of the type of method they use, the type of approach they use, to employers in carrying through such—their work.

I think those were the three I had in mind.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, one more question: You were here this morning apparently when we were questioning this other witness, Mr. Shaw.

Mrs. FUNN. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. Were you in here throughout his questioning and answering?

Mrs. FUNN. No; not the entire time.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, during the time you were here—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. DOYLE. Did you hear any question or observe any act by this committee which, in your judgment, was a trespass upon his civil rights in any way or his rights as an American citizen? In other words, did we put him on the spot in any way of which you now feel critical?

Mrs. FUNN. No, Mr. Doyle, and I can only say this: That if you treated Mr. Shaw as you have treated me, you have shown only one thing—that you're interested in getting at the facts. You are interested in helping to eliminate the causes which have made this subversive activity possible—

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mrs. FUNN (continuing). And I don't think in any instance you've infringed upon—you've infringed upon his rights as a citizen, or my rights as a citizen, and I have been very happy to come here and give any assistance that I have given; and any future assistance, please feel free to call on me.

Mr. DOYLE. May I make this one observation, then, Mr. Chairman: I notice that our counsel, Mr. Kunzig, called to your attention the fact in the early period of your questioning that you had been asked to be identified as a Negro.

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't know why you asked him to do that, but that is your business. However, I think it leaves it so that I can ask you and urge you, as one of the recognized thinkers and leaders among the American Negro people, that you get the message out, especially to the Negro people, of our great Nation, for whom I have great respect and appreciation, of the fact of how this committee has functioned in your judgment. I think you can do great good.

Mrs. FUNN. I will be very happy to; very happy to.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, in view of something she said, I move to make one observation: You have witnessed here today a fair sample of the kind of hearings the committee has been conducting regularly, with the exception that perhaps sometimes we have witnesses who become rather obstreperous and who insist upon making a scene; but aside from that what you have heard is typical of the hearings we conduct.

Now, based on that, would you not say that no one's rights are being invaded in any way?

Mrs. FUNN. I would say that is absolutely true.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, in order to clarify my question a moment ago, as I understand from counsel, the Communists whom you recognized in the audience were here under subpoena.

Mr. KUNZIG. Some of the people in this audience are here under subpoena; yes, sir.

I would like to make an announcement at this point with regard to the subpoenas: That the subpoenas of all those people in this courtroom who have been subpoenaed for today will be continued until tomorrow, unless they have heard otherwise by telegram or hear otherwise tonight by telegram—

And I believe, sir, the time will be 10 tomorrow?

Mr. VELDE. Ten a. m.

Mr. KUNZIG. Ten a. m. tomorrow morning.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask you just one more question?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you identify or name all those you saw here in the audience? Were they among those you named in your testimony?

Mrs. FUNN. No; I couldn't possibly do that. Some of those I've named I've seen here in this audience.

Mr. MOULDER. Oh, I see.

That is all.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier, do you have some further questions?

Mr. FRAZIER. I would like to ask the witness this in regard to the recommendations made to the committee for legislation: As a matter of fact, those were the things you were down in Washington lobbying for, weren't they?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. FRAZIER. You are making the same recommendation to this committee now that you were down there lobbying for back a good many years ago?

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. FRAZIER. That is all.

Mrs. FUNN. I might—

Mr. FRAZIER. I don't mean to be facetious about it, but at the time you were making those recommendations you were a member of the Communist Party.

Mrs. FUNN. And I still have the feeling for the rights of Negroes I had then.

That is the reason why I joined the Communist Party. However, finding the Communist Party was not the answer to what I had wanted, I had since left the Communist Party; but the ills, the reason—my basic reason for joining has not yet been alleviated. You see—

Mr. FRAZIER. Well, that is just what I wanted to bring out—

Mrs. FUNN. Yes.

Mr. FRAZIER (continuing). And I am glad you have left the Communist Party.

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mrs. Funn, speaking for myself—and I think I can speak for the other members of the committee—I say you have been a most cordial, gracious, and informative witness. I am sure the information you have given to this committee will be most valuable. You have added a great deal to the information that the committee has already assembled in accordance with the instructions that have been given to us by our colleagues in the House of Representatives; and unless there is something further, Mr. Counsel—

Mr. KUNZIG. Nothing further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And members of the committee, you are dismissed with the committee's thanks.

The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:40 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 5, 1953.)





# INDEX

## INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Acheson, Dean	1185
Akeson, Virgil	1216
Avnet, Marcella	1204
Beitscher, Henry	1209
Belton, Lem	1217
Blumberg, Albert (Al)	1209, 1213, 1215, 1216, 1224
Blumberg, Dorothy	1216
Bogart, Humphrey	1181
Bouslog, Harriet	1208
Brahdy, Clara Rieber	1203
Branca, James	1210
Braverman, Maurice	1217
Campbell, Robert	1203
Cayton, Revels	1213
Chancey, Martin	1215
Chaplin	1185
Chapman, Stanley	1198
Clinton, Rose	1215
Clott, Herman	1208, 1215
Cohen, Robert	1198, 1199
Coleman, Edna Rosenberg	1198
Cousins, Calvin	1216
Curran, Joe	1214, 1215
Dale, Thelma	1213
D'Avila, Sarah Hartman	1210
De Caux, Len	1210
Dodd, Bella	1223
Einstein	1171
Elfenbein, Sylvia	1203
Evans, Gertrude	1216
Finkelstein, Jeannette	1196, 1198, 1200
Finkelstein, Ruth	1196-1198, 1200
Flacks, David	1203
Flacks, Mildred	1197, 1203
Frankfeld, Phil	1213
Funn, Mrs. Dorothy K.	1194-1229 (testimony)
Gilman, Sarah ( <i>see also</i> Sarah Gilman Rosenblatt)	1198, 1201, 1204
Goldberg, Beatrice	1198
Greenberg, Dr.	1217
Grossman, Mildred	1202
Gurewitz, Casey	1215
Haddock, Hoyt	1209
Hall, Bob	1213
Hartman, Sarah	1210
Hollis, Gloria Johnson	1217
Jacobs, Florence (Mrs. Julius Jacobs)	1201, 1203
Jacobs, Julius	1201, 1203
Jacobs, Mrs. Julius (Florence Jacobs)	1201
Johnson, Gloria	1217
Johnson, Jack	1201
Johnson, Norman B.	1194-1229
Johnson, William	1216, 1217
Joliot-Curie	1185

	Page
Kahn, Martha Lepowsky	1202
Koppelman, Hyman	1197
Kraft, Hy	1155, 1156, 1167
Laumon, Al	1216
Lepowsky, Martha	1202
Levine, Seth	1209
Mann, Thomas	1171
Mindel, Pop (J. Mindel)	1218
Moreau, Alberto	1200
Nechemias, Ann	1197
Newman, Arthur	1202
Nixon, Russell A	1208, 1209
Olson, Rose	1203
Ormandy, Eugene	1171
Pelham, Beatrice Goldberg	1197
Perlin, Paul	1154, 1155, 1158, 1169, 1170
Peters, J	1221
Randolph, A. Philip	1213
Richardson, Marie	1216
Richardson, Thomas	1209
Richter, Irvin	1208
Rieber, Clara	1203
Riedman, Maurice	1203
Rosenberg, Edna	1198
Rosenblatt, Sara Gilman ( <i>also see</i> Sarah Gilman)	1202
Salz, Morris	1196, 1202, 1203
Sasuly, Elizabeth	1210
Schary, Dore	1157, 1171
Searle, Elizabeth	1210
Shandros, Geraldine (Gerry)	1208, 1215
Shaw, Artie	1150-1194 (testimony), 1228
Sherman, Bob	1209, 1210
Shields, Art	1217
Silver, Max	1154
Sinatra, Frank	1156
Smith, Ferdinand C	1213
Smith, Gerald L. K	1174, 1175
Strong, Edward	1225
Strong, Everett	1213
Taylor, Shirley	1215
Taylor, William (Bill)	1209, 1210, 1213, 1215-1217
Thomas, Henry	1217
Townsend, Leo	1154, 1155
Townsend, Mrs. Leo	1155
Wacker, Charlotte	1202
Wanger, Walter	1157
Weinberger, Andrew D	1150-1194
White, Herb	1158, 1162-1164, 1168, 1170, 1172
Wilkerson, Dorey	1216
Willoughby, Mary	1217
Wright, Herb	1158, 1162-1164, 1168, 1170, 1172
Yer au, Max	1213
Zucker, Jack	1215

## ORGANIZATIONS

American Communication Association	1208
American Federation of Labor	1216
American Federation of Labor, Cooks' Union	1217
American Legion	1183
American Peace Mobilization	1175, 1183
Anti-Poll Tax Committee	1210
Cafeteria Workers	1215
City College of New York	1195
Civil Rights Congress	1180, 1182, 1212, 1215, 1220
Civil Rights Congress, Los Angeles Chapter	1180

# INDEX

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

3 9999 05018 575 3

Columbia University	1176, 1177
Committee for Democratic Far Eastern Policy	1183
Committee for the First Amendment	1184
Committee for the World Congress for Peace	1208, 1215, 1216
Congress of Industrial Organizations	1206, 1210, 1215
Food and Tobacco Workers	1201
Franklin K. Lane High School	1215
Furniture Workers' Union	1204
Girls' High School (Brooklyn)	
Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions	1156-1158, 1161-1163, 1165-1168, 1171, 1174, 1175, 1184
Howard University	1206, 1208
International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union	1205
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People	1172, 1184, 1185
National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions	1206
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties	1206, 1209, 1213-1216
National Maritime Union	1195, 1204-1206, 1212-1214, 1216, 1218-1220, 1223, 1225
National Negro Congress	1195, 1204
Negro Labor Victory Committee	1217
New York Board of Education	1195
New York State CIO Political Action Committee	1195
New York University	1172, 1185
Paris Peace Conference	1198
Public School 3, Brooklyn	1198
Public School 35, Brooklyn	1198
Public School 44, Brooklyn	1198
Public School 129, Brooklyn	1198
Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace	1172, 1185, 1191
Screen Writers' Guild	1165, 1167, 1171
United Auto Workers	1206, 1208, 1211, 1214, 1215
United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America	1208, 1209
United Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, CIO	1208
United Nations	1218
United Public Workers of America	1209, 1210
Washington Industrial Union Council	1209, 1210, 1216
World Peace Congress	1171, 1183-1185

## PUBLICATIONS

The Communist	1223, 1224
Congress of Industrial Organizations News	1210
Daily Worker	1181, 1182, 1213, 1215, 1217
New York Herald Tribune	1171
New York Times	1171





INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE  
NEW YORK CITY AREA—Part 2

---

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

5. Congress. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

---

MAY 5, 1953

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1953

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

CLYDE DOYLE, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

## C O N T E N T S

---

May 5, 1953:

Testimony of—

	Page
Robert Cohen.....	1236
David Flacks.....	1245
Mildred Flacks.....	1250
Julius G. Jacobs.....	1253
Florence H. Jacobs.....	1257
Mortimer Offner.....	1261
Cedric Henning Belfrage.....	1272
Arnaud D'Usseau.....	1301
Jerome Robbins.....	1315
Carin Kinzel Burrows.....	1327
Index.....	1339





The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, \* \* \**

## PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### RULE X

#### SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

### RULE XI

#### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the house in sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.



# INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA—PART 2

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*New York, N. Y.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10:12 a. m., in room 1105, United States courthouse, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, Gordon L. Scherer, Clyde Doyle (appearance noted in transcript), and James B. Frazier, Jr.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; W. Jackson Jones, Earl L. Fuoss, and George C. Williams, investigators, Dolores Anderson and Thelma Scearce, staff representatives; Leslie C. Scott, research analyst; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show present are Mr. Kearney, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, a quorum of the full committee.

Do you have a witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. Robert Cohen.

Mr. VELDE. Are you Mr. Cohen?

Mr. COHEN. That's right.

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand?

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. COHEN. I do.

Mr. VELDE. Be seated.

Mr. KUNZIG. If you are represented by counsel, would counsel please state his name and address for the record?

Mr. SCHEIN. George Schein—S-c-h-e-i-n—154 Nassau Street, New York 38.

Mr. KUNZIG. Just sit down.

Mr. COHEN. May I ask a question?

Mr. KUNZIG. The witness wishes to ask a question.

Mr. COHEN. Do I have to face the cameras, so I have the cameras on me?

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, the witness has asked a question as to whether he is required to face the cameras.

Mr. VELDE. Well, let me ask the witness this: If the gentlemen of the press take your picture before you begin your testimony, would that be satisfactory?

Mr. COHEN. Yes; that's all right.

# TESTIMONY OF ROBERT COHEN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, GEORGE SCHEIN

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your name—and would you spell it for the record, Mr. Cohen?

Mr. COHEN. Robert Cohen—C-o-h-e-n.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is there any middle initial?

Mr. COHEN. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Just Robert Cohen—C-o-h-e-n?

Mr. COHEN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your address, Mr. Cohen?

Mr. COHEN. 1250 President Street, Brooklyn 25.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background?

Mr. COHEN. Well, I'm a graduate of the College of the City of New York. I have a bachelor's degree.

Mr. KUNZIG. What year?

Mr. COHEN. 1931.

And I have a master's degree from the same institution—1935.

I've also taken various in-service and graduate courses at NYU.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, would you kindly give the committee a résumé of your employment background?

Mr. COHEN. Well, I served as a substitute teacher from 1931 to 1938 in the New York City schools.

In 1938 I was appointed a teacher of English in the junior high school, and I served until 1945 as a teacher of English.

In 1945 I was assigned as an acting assistant to the principal, and in 1946 I was appointed as a regular assistant to the principal; and I served also as an acting principal for a time, too, for one term, when the principal was out on leave.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present position?

Mr. COHEN. Assistant to principal.

Mr. KUNZIG. Assistant to the principal of what school?

Mr. COHEN. Junior High School 227, Brooklyn.

Mr. KUNZIG. Junior High School 227, Brooklyn.

You are presently employed in the New York school system?

Mr. COHEN. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Cohen, yesterday, before this committee, sworn testimony was adduced from a Mrs. Funn<sup>1</sup> to the effect that she knew you as a member of the Communist Party at one time. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mr. Cohen conferred with Mr. Schein.)

Mr. COHEN. Well, as I tried to indicate before, I've been a member of the school system now for close to 18 years. During all of that time I've acted in accordance with many basic educational principles.

<sup>1</sup> Dorothy K. Funn.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the witness hasn't answered the question. It was a simple question asked and I would like to have personally a yes or no answer.

(At this point Mr. Cohen conferred with Mr. Schein.)

Mr. VELDE. Yes; I think the question is very simple. I believe the witness was in the hearing room here yesterday when Mrs. Funn was testifying—

(At this point Mr. Cohen conferred with Mr. Schein.)

Mr. VELDE (continuing). And if you will answer the question first, then you will be given an opportunity to explain your connections with the New York school system, and any other thing you care to explain.

Mr. COHEN. Well, may I say two things first: First, I have gone through a lot of mental and physical anguish since I received your subpoena on Thursday; and, second, I would like to be able to answer the question in my own way since my professional and my personal career is involved, and I think in all fairness I should be able to do that.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Well, I certainly agree with the witness, but I do think you owe it to your Government and to the committee to answer the question yes or no first as to your membership in the Communist Party. Then, of course, we would certainly give you a chance to explain that relationship of the Communist Party, if there is—

Mr. COHEN. May I consult with my attorney for a moment, then?

Mr. VELDE. Certainly.

(At this point Mr. Cohen conferred with Mr. Schein.)

Mr. COHEN. The cameras I referred to are those—are those newspaper cameras up there.

Mr. VELDE. Well, now, may I ask the witness this: If I do order—or if the committee does order—the cameras turned off and the lights turned off, would the witness then answer the questions put to him by counsel?

Mr. COHEN. Well, I would feel more at ease. That is my point.

Mr. VELDE. Well, would you answer the question as to your membership in the Communist Party if the lights were ordered turned off and the television and newsreel cameras ordered to desist? Would you then be willing to cooperate with the committee in that regard?

Mr. COHEN. May I speak to my counsel for a moment, please?

(At this point Mr. Cohen conferred with Mr. Schein.)

I would like to say this: Originally when I came here I asked that I be as comfortable as possible, and I am sure you gentlemen want to grant that. At that time there were no qualifications.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you object to testifying before the cameras? Is that—

Mr. COHEN. It just makes me a little uncomfortable. I am a little tired, frankly.

Mr. JACKSON. It is also uncomfortable, I might say, for all of us because the lights are equally hot on the members.

I think the question is: Do you object to testifying before the cameras?

Mr. COHEN. I think so.

Mr. VELDE. Well, in that case, the cameras will please desist and the lights will be turned off; and I want to say, by word of explanation to the general public, that the committee feels the public is entitled to the information that is presented here by witnesses, and we do everything we can to make that information available to the public. However, where a witness refuses to be televised or refuses to testify under the strong lights, we feel that we owe him the courtesy and the right to such refusal; and, so, we ask that the lights be turned off and that the proceedings aren't to be televised further.

Mr. COHEN. Thanks very much.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, may it not be made a little plainer to the witness that when you said he might read a statement or make some explanation, after he answers, that that is, of course, a statement that he may make if he answers yes or no; if he refuses to testify, then the permission to make such explanatory statement is not granted?

Mr. VELDE. I think that has been made very clear.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I object to the witness reading any statement. It has never been customary for a witness to come before this committee and read a statement. There is a chance and an opportunity for him to file a statement with the committee after he testifies; but as far as reading it before——

Mr. VELDE. Yes; that is a correct interpretation of our procedure here before to date, but did the witness have a statement he wished to——

Mr. COHEN. No; this is a summary of my experience in school, in the school system, but it is not a statement. I do have some notes here.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, would you answer the question? I think you know what it was.

Mr. COHEN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COHEN. Well, I want to decline to answer that question on the basis of the first and fifth amendment and the ninth and tenth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you keep your voice up, Witness?

It is very difficult to hear.

Mr. COHEN. I am sorry.

Mr. VELDE. You say you want to decline to answer?

Mr. COHEN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Do you so decline to answer on that basis?

Mr. COHEN. Yes; I do.

And now may I say something?

I've been a member of the school system now for 18 years, and I'm proud of my record, and I have here testimonials from the superintendent of schools, the principals, supervisors, about my loyalty and about the fact that I have never done anything wrong or inimical to the interest of the United States of America. As a matter of fact, I have testimonials here indicating that in any important instances not only have I not been inimical to the best interests of our country, but that I've helped strengthen democracy and——

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Cohen, this——

Mr. KEARNEY. May I interrupt, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. All right, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Cohen, you have declined to answer——

Mr. COHEN. Well, I——

Mr. KEARNEY. Seeking refuge behind the first and fifth amendments when you were asked the question, "Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?"

Now, let me ask you this question: If you were never a member of the Communist Party or not a member of the Communist Party at the present time, would you refuse to answer?

(At this point Mr. Cohen conferred with Mr. Schein.)

Mr. COHEN. May I consult?

Mr. KEARNEY. Certainly.

(At this point Mr. Cohen conferred with Mr. Schein.)

Mr. COHEN. Well, I'd like to say two things on that.

Mr. KEARNEY. No; I am going to insist, Mr. Chairman, that the witness answer my question. It is a very simple question.

Mr. COHEN. Then I will have to decline to answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. You decline to answer it?

Mr. COHEN. But I also wanted—I am sure if I had finished that part of what I wanted to say it would have been a little more clear.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I shall object to his being permitted to go any further. There is no question pending.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Cohen, in fairness to you, I want to read you, because the committee endeavors at all times to be fair, a few sentences of the testimony of yesterday and ask you to consider now whether you wish to answer. Mrs. Funn said, referring to you:

Yes; he was a member of the group then.

This was about 1939.

However, he didn't meet with the group too long after I joined. I recall that in September of 1939 we met—when school started, we started meeting again, and I should say by November he had ceased meeting with us. Maybe it was a little bit later than that, but I know his meeting with the group became infrequent, and he gave as his excuse he was studying to take the assistant principal's examination.

Now, I ask you again—I will make it more definite: Were you a member of this teachers' group of the Communist Party connected with the Bedford-Stuyvesant section?

Mr. COHEN. I must again decline to answer that.

Mr. KUNZIG. You decline to answer?

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Cohen, let me ask you this question: In your own mind, what possible incrimination could you, as an individual, have by your admission, if you were a member of the Communist Party, by so stating?

Mr. COHEN. May I speak to my attorney, please?

Mr. KEARNEY. Certainly.

(At this point Mr. Cohen conferred with Mr. Schein.)

Mr. COHEN. I am advised in the present situation of the statutes it may make my answer appear to be serving as a witness against myself.

Mr. KEARNEY. Then what possible incrimination could you have if you had stated in answer to my previous question you were not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COHEN. Well, I think the answer is the same.

Mr. CLARDY. I can't hear you, Witness.

Mr. COHEN. I think the answer is the same, except for one thing, as I tried to say before—I must decline to answer for several reasons—this statement—but you did not permit me to complete and I respectfully ask——

Mr. KEARNEY. Do I understand now by your declination to answer as to whether you were not a member of the Communist Party that that would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. COHEN. Well, not to incriminate me, but it seems it would violate my own ideas of freedom of conscience on the—under the first amendment; and that is what I tried to say before.

I think America is the finest country in the world mainly because it has this great heritage of freedom, and I've read that in many, many fine people——

Mr. KEARNEY. What do you mean by freedom of conscience?

Mr. COHEN. A freedom of conscience——

Mr. KEARNEY. I am interested in your definition of conscience of freedom.

Mr. COHEN. Well, I think that freedom of thought means that people should, regarding any social question, have an opportunity to discuss different points of view.

Mr. KEARNEY. But you think——

Mr. COHEN. As a result of that, the best possible point of view would prevail and the country progress.

Now, I am familiar with a man by the name of Thomas Erskine, for example, a 19th century Englishman, or 18th century. When this question came up he said England was the greatest country in the world, and at that time it was, and for it to maintain its supremacy as a world power and progress in efficiency and human welfare it must permit freedom of thought.

Mr. KEARNEY. And when you speak of freedom of thought——

Mr. COHEN. May I finish?

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). Are you talking about the so-called academic freedom I have listened to so many times when teachers get on the witness stand?

Mr. COHEN. Well, I guess that is one freedom.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is there any thought also in your mind on the subject of civic responsibility?

Mr. COHEN. Yes; I think freedom carries with it responsibility, and I think you as a committeeman and I as a teacher have the joint responsibility to see that the atmosphere in the United States of America is so clear that people——

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words——

Mr. COHEN (continuing). Can even express unpopular views at times——

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, academic freedom and civic responsibility——

Mr. COHEN. Go hand in hand.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are more or less tied together, aren't they?

Mr. COHEN. And I think they are also interrelated—that it is our responsibility to maintain and strengthen freedom.

The superintendent of schools and authorities——



Mr. KEARNEY. I am not interested in what the superintendent of schools said. I am interested in your own testimony.

Mr. COHEN. We have a publication called Strengthening Democracy—it seems that is what it is all about—in which we have a clear atmosphere in which people can think, even unpopular items, even unpopular ideas—

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you admitting—

Mr. COHEN. So we can maintain our supremacy of the world.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you admitting to me communism is an unpopular idea today?

Mr. COHEN. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that the reason you decline to answer the question?

Mr. COHEN. Excuse me.

(At this point Mr. Cohen conferred with Mr. Schein.)

Mr. COHEN (continuing). I will have to decline to answer that, but—

Mr. KEARNEY. All right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Cohen, no one disagrees with you that there should be freedom for unpopular ideas, but do you feel that Communists should teach in the schools, in the city schools of New York, today, along with the ideas you just expressed as to freedom?

Mr. COHEN. I feel that, if a teacher does not use his classroom to subvert the United States Government or to say anything inimical to the Government or to indoctrinate his students at any political belief or slant his lesson, he does not belong in the school system; but, as far as his freedom of conscience is concerned, I don't know actually. I feel, if he is developing and strengthening democracy and doing a good job, he should be rated on his merits as a teacher and as a citizen.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you feel that a member of the Communist Party today as a teacher in the school is not bound by Communist Party dictates and can be a free teacher and teach without any connection with communism; is that right?

Mr. COHEN. Frankly, I don't know. I would say this: I'm not a psychologist, but I've read books on psychology, and one of the basic laws of human nature is the fact that individuals differ.

(Representative Clyde Doyle entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. COHEN (continuing). The law of individual differences would indicate the possibility, the very real possibility, that you could have Communist A, who would be bound, and Communist B who would not be bound.

Mr. KUNZIG. Wouldn't you think then, since the public can't differentiate between A or B, that the people of the city of New York or the people of the United States of America would have a right not to be required to send their children to schools where Communists teach?

Mr. COHEN. Well, as I indicated before, if they felt their children were not growing up as loyal, decent, intelligent citizens, if they felt that their teacher was doing something to hurt their children, they should remove the children from the school.

Mr. VELDE. Let's—

Mr. CLARDY. Leave the teacher there, in other words?

Mr. COHEN. Well, I'm sorry. I was answering this gentleman's question. It was the prosthesis of the conditional clause there that was referred to.

I don't mean that the teachers—I think the teacher should be dismissed there. As I indicated before, if the teacher indoctrinates, the teacher should be dismissed.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Cohen—

Mr. JACKSON. Do you think there is a Communist who does not indoctrinate?

Mr. COHEN. I have no way of knowing, except I do know, as I said before—

Mr. JACKSON. Well—

Mr. COHEN (continuing). There are individual differences.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, the official publication of the Communist Party, the Communist, some years ago in discussing the relationship of teachers to the Communist Party, stressed the fact that the Communist teacher, like any other Communist, must at all times do everything within his or her power to forward the official line of the party.

Now, that is out of the mouth of the Communist Party itself.

May I ask if you make any distinction between a Communist teacher in the city schools of New York and a North Korean Communist in the lines in Korea, aside from ethnic differences or geographical location, so far as philosophy is concerned? Is there a fundamental difference, or do you recognize a valid distinction?

Isn't it a fact that they read the same textbooks; they are subject to the same discipline, the same directive, no matter where they may be?

Mr. COHEN. I am not familiar with that. I am sorry, I don't know.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well.

Mr. SCHIERER. May I just say this—

Mr. VELDE. Let me make a statement, if you will, Mr. Scherer.

The committee is interested in obtaining facts relative to subversion in the United States, and it has been determined by many official bodies—I think most American citizens now feel—the Soviet Government operating through the American Communist Party is a conspiracy, a worldwide conspiracy. The facts that we are authorized to obtain relative to subversion by the House of Representatives do not include a lot of opinions from a witness who refuses to answer a question as to his Communist Party connections.

I cannot see too much reason for proceeding to question the witness relative to any opinion he might have unless he is willing to furnish the committee with facts relative to his connections with the Communist Party.

It is the Chair's opinion that the testimony of Mrs. Funn relative to your past connection with the Communist Party is true. Relative to your present connection with the Communist Party, the Chair can only infer that, with your refusal to answer the question as to your present party connection, you must be a member of the Communist Party at this time, and unless the counsel has some further questions—

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). To elicit the facts, I think we should proceed—

Mr. KUNZIG. I think—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Because we have a number of witnesses.

Mr. KUNZIG. There is one other point I would like to bring out further.

Is Mr. John Dunne in the hearing room?

Mr. Dunne, I believe you are here representing the school system of New York City and Dr. William Janson, and I have a subpoena here for a document which I would like to get from you right now.

(Document was handed to Mr. Kunzig by Mr. Dunne.)

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). This document, Mr. Dunne, I take it, is from the files of the school system of New York.

Now, Mr. Cohen, I should like to read to you a statement which you made before the school system of New York, sworn to in front of Joseph A. Grastatares—G-r-a-s-t-a-t-a-r-e-s—notary public, State of New York. [Reading:]

Robert Cohen, being duly sworn, deposes and says—

This is the 6th day of March 1952.

I am not now, nor have I ever been, a member of the Communist Party or the Communist Political Association. In particular, I have not been a member or participated in the activities of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Club of the Communist Party.

I have never attended any meetings of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Club of the Communist Party nor of any other club, group, or section of the Communist Party. In particular, I have never attended any meetings of any group which discussed Communist Party policy in relation to teachers at the homes of Morris Salz, Anna Nechemias, or Mildred Flacks. In fact, I have never visited the homes of Morris Salz or Anna Nechemias, and on a few occasions visited the home of Mildred Flacks, and on those occasions my attendance was purely social or in connection with matters not pertaining to the Communist Party.

I have never attended meetings of any group at which reports were read of pamphlets written by Lenin, Stalin, or Dimitrov, nor of Manual of Organization of the Communist Party by J. Peters.

I at no time declared I was leaving the Communist Party because of lack of time and due to the fact I was busily engaged in preparing myself for examination for assistant principal.

I have never contributed funds to the Communist Party, nor have I ever recruited members for the Communist Party.

I have read the contents of this affidavit and reaffirm the truth of each and every statement herein contained to the best of my knowledge and recollection.

(Signed) ROBERT COHEN.

Sworn to before me the 6th day of March 1952.

JOSEPH A. GRASTATARES, Notary Public.

Now, I ask you the same question again: Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party or the Communist Political Association?

I am reading directly from your own sworn affidavit to the school system.

Mr. COHEN. Well, as I stated before, I must decline to answer those questions!

Mr. KUNZIG. So, in other words, you are willing to sign a paper for the school system and sign it under oath before a notary public, but you are not willing to answer the same questions under oath before this committee; is that correct?

MR. COHEN. I must refuse to answer that, but I would like to say this: It doesn't seem to me this is a court of law. I don't think I have due process here, where I have cross examination—

MR. VELDE. Well, Mr. Cohen, this certainly is not a court of law. This is a congressional committee, a committee of—

MR. COHEN. When you have to assume—

MR. VELDE (continuing). The United States Congress.

MR. COHEN (continuing). You are guilty, I don't think that follows the tenets of the—

MR. KEARNEY. Mr. Cohen, I ask you why you signed that affidavit?

MR. COHEN. I must decline to answer the question, as I—

MR. KEARNEY. If you did sign that affidavit in 1952, your testimony today is a little in variance with the affidavit you made under that date as to whether you were a member of the Communist Party or not.

MR. COHEN. Well—excuse me for a moment.

(At this point Mr. Cohen conferred with Mr. Schein.)

MR. COHEN. Well, as I tried to indicate a minute ago, this is not an opportunity to clear myself because we don't follow—

MR. KEARNEY. Is that your signature on that affidavit?

MR. KUNZIG. I will pass it to you again.

MR. COHEN. I must decline to answer that.

MR. KEARNEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't see the sense of pursuing this questioning—

MR. KUNZIG. That's right.

MR. KEARNEY (continuing). Of this witness.

Personally, from his testimony here, it is my humble opinion that it is absolutely unworthy of belief.

MR. VELDE. The Chair concurs with the gentleman from New York. Does counsel have any further questions?

MR. KUNZIG. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

MR. CLARDY. I don't think it would do any good.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

(No response.)

MR. DOYLE.

MR. DOYLE. No questions.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER. No questions.

MR. VELDE. Is there any reason why this witness should be further retained?

If not, the witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

MR. COHEN. Mr. Velde—

MR. VELDE. The counsel will call his next witness.

MR. KUNZIG. Mr. David Flacks.

MR. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. FLACKS. I do.

MR. VELDE. May we have order.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Flacks, you are represented by council, I see.

Would counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. CAMMER. Harold I. Cammer—C-a-m-m-e-r—9 East 40th Street, New York 16.

**TESTIMONY OF DAVID FLACKS, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,  
HAROLD I. CAMMER**

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state your full name for the record?

Mr. FLACKS. David Flacks.

Mr. KUNZIG. F-l-a-c-k-s?

Mr. FLACKS. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your address, Mr. Flacks?

Mr. FLACKS. Must I give my address?

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I request that the witness be required to answer the question.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; the witness is directed to answer that question.

Mr. FLACKS. I would like to explain why I don't want to give it.

Mr. KUNZIG. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the witness is about to make a speech. I request that the witness be asked to answer this simple question: What is his address?

Mr. FLACKS. My address is 1444 Carroll Street. I am not ashamed of it, but when my wife was dismissed from the school system her address was mentioned in the papers and we had many anti-Semitic letters; and I object to that kind of circus here, and that is why I refused to give my address.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, I wish to state I also object—and I am sure every member of the committee objects—to anti-Semitism.

Now, we will go right on with the questioning.

Mr. FLACKS. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. VELDE. I must warn the audience here that it will be necessary for me to order anyone who causes a demonstration removed from the hearing room.

These hearings will have to be conducted in an orderly fashion.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Flacks, would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background, please?

Mr. FLACKS. I went to New York City public schools, New York City high schools, graduated from the City College with an A. B. degree.

Mr. KUNZIG. What year?

Mr. FLACKS. 1927.

I got a master of science degree in 1931; did postgraduate work at Columbia and City College.

Ever since then I have been taking what we call alertness courses and courses for improvement of teaching. I have been giving many courses, too.

Mr. KUNZIG. Giving courses to whom?

Mr. FLACKS. To teachers in the public school system at the direction of the superintendent of schools.

Mr. KUNZIG. How many years have you been doing that?

Mr. FLACKS. Twenty-six years.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have been teaching other teachers for 26 years?

Mr. FLACKS. No; I've been teaching in the school system for 26 years.

Mr. KUNZIG. How many years have you been teaching other teachers?

Mr. FLACKS. Oh, I didn't give too many courses, but I must have been doing that for about 5 years.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, will you give the committee a résumé of your occupational background?

Mr. FLACKS. I've been in the elementary school system since 1927. I taught sixth grade-fifth grade classes. I am a music specialist. I am also in charge of audio-visual instruction, which means cameras and phonographs and radio equipment. I'm also in charge of many other things in the school. I've been in my present school for about 17 years.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever had any connection with a New York Teacher News, the publication of the Teachers' Union?

Mr. FLACKS. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. What connection have you had with that?

Mr. FLACKS. I have been a member of the editorial staff.

Mr. KUNZIG. From when to when, if you can recall?

Mr. FLACKS. From 1939 to the present day, 1940.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present position with the New York Teacher News?

Mr. FLACKS. I am a staff worker. I help out with the editorial work—

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever—

Mr. FLACKS. Copy readying; make-up.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been an official of the local 555?

Mr. FLACKS. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever run for a union election?

Mr. FLACKS. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. What position were you running for?

Mr. FLACKS. Member of the executive board of the Teachers' Union.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were, I presume, then, defeated—at least you were not elected to the position?

Mr. FLACKS. Well, the member of an executive board is not an official of the union.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Then, what position have you held with the union?

Mr. FLACKS. I have been on the executive board of the Teachers' Union for many years now.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have been on the executive board of the Teachers' Union and you have been on the editorial staff of the New York Teachers' News?

Mr. FLACKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you heard the testimony here yesterday by Mrs. Funn,<sup>1</sup> in which she identified you as a member of the Communist Party during the period in which she was a member. Have you ever at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FLACKS. I will decline to answer that question on the following grounds: First, I don't believe this committee has any right to ask me that question. I believe this committee is subverting the—

Mr. KEARNEY. That's been gone over—

<sup>1</sup> Dorothy K. Funn.

Mr. FLACKS. Not by me, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). Quite some time ago.

Mr. FLACKS. Not by me.

Mr. KEARNEY. Not by you, but a good many witnesses, and also others who were not witnesses.

Mr. FLACKS. But I would like to make a statement, too.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I submit that he has merely the right to state he stands on the familiar constitutional grounds, and beyond that should not be permitted to make a speech.

Mr. VELDE. Well, we are certainly not interested in a tirade here—

Mr. FLACKS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Or further abuse of the committee. We have had this thing happen time and time before.

Mr. FLACKS. I know, but I have not done it before.

Mr. VELDE. No, but by witnesses just like you.

Mr. FLACKS. Now, yesterday—

Mr. VELDE. If you will answer the question, as I told the previous witness, the question asked you, "Yes" or "No," then you will be given an opportunity—

Mr. FLACKS. I am trying to answer the question in my own way.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). To make an explanation; but we shall not allow you to make any explanation or tirade against this committee. It is trying its best to do the function which is imposed upon it by Congress.

Mr. FLACKS. And I am trying my best, sir—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). We have other witnesses—

Mr. FLACKS (continuing). To protect my reputation—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). To hear.

Mr. FLACKS (continuing). And career.

Will you allow me to do so, sir?

I listened yesterday, sir—

Mr. VELDE. Will you answer the question put to you by counsel "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. FLACKS. I certainly will answer the question in my own way.

Mr. VELDE. Answer it "Yes" or "No". It is a very simple question.

Mr. FLACKS. Yesterday I listened to 4 hours of testimony by 2 persons I wouldn't be associated with, and this committee didn't interrupt them more than 2 times.

Mr. CLARDY. Those witnesses were not contemptuous of the committee, sir.

Mr. FLACKS. I am not contemptuous.

Mr. VELDE. Those witnesses did not refuse to answer questions by counsel—

Mr. FLACKS. In other words—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Or by the committee.

Mr. FLACKS (continuing). You will listen only to witnesses who will answer your questions as you want them answered.

Mr. VELDE. No; not that at all.

Mr. FLACKS. Well, let me—

Mr. VELDE. Just refuse to answer.

Mr. FLACKS (continuing). Answer the question—

Mr. VELDE. You are making a distinction between a refusal to answer and answering the question "Yes" or "No," in which case you would be given a right to make an explanation.

Mr. FLACKS. I maintain when you ask a question, sir, I may be permitted to answer it in my own way.

I don't like your questions and I am not going to answer them the way you want me to.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, this has gone on long enough. I ask that he be directed to answer.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; you are directed to answer.

Mr. FLACKS. On the grounds——

Mr. VELDE. If you don't remember it, we will have it restated or the reporter will repeat it.

Mr. FLACKS. I would like to state my reasons for refusing to answer the questions.

Now, I would like to——

Mr. CLARDY. You have been told, Witness, to answer it first.

Mr. FLACKS. Yes, sir. I am going to answer it right now.

Mr. CLARDY. Answer it one way or another.

Mr. FLACKS. I am declining to answer these questions on the following grounds: First, that the question violates my rights under the first amendment, under the fifth amendment, under the sixth amendment, under the ninth amendment, and under the tenth amendment; and under each one of these amendments, which the Constitution grants to me and to 150 million other people in this country, no witness, before such a committee, is required to answer this type of question because the Constitution protects the innocent and the guilty, and I want it clearly understood here that there's no question of my being guilty or innocent of any crime.

I maintain my innocence of any wrongdoing. I have never committed a crime or a wrongdoing in this country. I never even got a traffic ticket.

Mr. KEARNEY. Have you been accused of a crime since you sat in the witness chair?

Mr. FLACKS. I have not, but you seem to imply I am going to be.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is what you are implying.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. One of your grounds for refusal to answer is the fifth amendment, under which you say your answer might tend to incriminate you.

Mr. FLACKS. No, sir; the fifth amendment doesn't say anything about the incrimination. The fifth amendment says no witness should bear—no person should bear witness against himself.

Mr. VELDE. That is in a——

Mr. CLARDY. In a criminal action.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Criminal trial.

Mr. FLACKS. That is right.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Then, you are in effect telling the committee there may be some crime uncovered against you——

Mr. FLACKS. No, sir; I am not telling the committee anything.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). If you should answer.

Mr. FLACKS. You are telling me that.

Mr. JACKSON. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. Mr. Frazier asked for the floor.



Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. I wanted to ask the witness whether or not if he was a member of the Republican or Democratic Party he would also invoke his rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. FLACKS. I think if I was asked this question, sir, by this committee I would invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. FRAZIER. I just wanted to know.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. I want to ask one further question on the record: Are you presently teaching in the school system of New York?

Mr. FLACKS. Yes; I am—Public School 174, Brooklyn.

Mr. KUNZIG. What grade is that?

Mr. FLACKS. Sixth grade.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

I don't think we should go any further with this witness.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. FLACKS. You told me, sir, when I answered the question I could make a statement.

Mr. VELDE. You didn't answer the question. It was very obvious to all those present.

Mr. FLACKS. Oh, but I did answer the question.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no questions in view of the declination to answer.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. For the same reasons, since he has refused to answer a straightforward question as to whether he is or is not a Communist, I have nothing further.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. FLACKS. May I say the committee did not give me the courtesy it gave its stoolpigeons yesterday.

Mr. JACKSON. You have shown this committee very little courtesy, I might add.

Mr. FLACKS. I am sorry. I have tried to be courteous, sir, and I have tried to answer your questions to the best of my ability.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, sir, the intimation of what you have said, regardless, indicates a very low regard for the committee, and it certainly—

Mr. FLACKS. Do you blame me for being angry, sir—

Mr. JACKSON. I am not—

Mr. FLACKS (continuing). In front of this circus?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, now, look, Mr. Flacks—

Mr. FLACKS. You just said something about intimations.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). The word "circus"—

Mr. FLACKS. You just intimated—

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Is offensive to begin with——

Mr. FLACKS. The circus is offensive.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). When addressed to a committee of the Congress of the United States, which is only carrying out the obligation imposed upon it by the Congress and 150 million Americans.

Mr. FLACKS. Did you read what Senator Lehman said about this committee last week?

Mr. JACKSON. I haven't read what Senator Lehman said about the committee.

Mr. FLACKS. May I quote him to you?

Mr. JACKSON. It is not at all relative to your appearance on the stand.

Mr. FLACKS. It certainly is.

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason why the witness should be further continued?

Mr. KUNZIG. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. If not, the witness is excused.

Call your next witness.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Mildred Flacks.

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand?

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. FLACKS. I do.

#### TESTIMONY OF MRS. MILDRED FLACKS, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, HAROLD I. CAMMER

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Flacks, I believe you are represented by the same counsel that was present with Mr. Flacks, and we will let the record show that.

(Mr. Harold I. Cammer, 9 East Fortieth Street, New York 16, N. Y., was present acting as Mrs. Flacks' counsel.)

Would you give your full name, please?

Mrs. FLACKS. Mildred Flacks.

Mr. KUNZIG. You are the wife of the past witness, Mr. David Flacks?

Mrs. FLACKS. Yes; I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background, please?

Mrs. FLACKS. I attended the Elementary High School of New York City and Jamaica Training School for Teachers, where I received my professional training for teaching. After that, I took many courses at City College and professional courses under the auspices of the board of education.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you then give the committee a résumé of your occupational background?

Mrs. FLACKS. I was graduated from Jamaica Training School in 1921. I did substituting until 1932, when I was assigned to school in Bedford-Stuyvesant. It was at that time PS 35.

Bedford-Stuyvesant is the—I don't know whether you know—one

of the underprivileged areas in Brooklyn, mainly populated by Negro children.

I was in this school in Bedford-Stuyvesant from 1932 until my dismissal in 1952—20 years.

Mr. KUNZIG. 1952?

Mrs. FLACKS. That's right, and during that time I would like to say that I worked with the first- and second-grade children entirely.

When I came to PS 35 in 1932, as a rather young substitute, rather young, inexperienced teacher, I found teaching not easy there because the school, PS 35, was one of the oldest schools in the city. Classes were overcrowded. It was in the middle of a depression, with families and children needing shoes, clothing. There wasn't a single playground in Bedford-Stuyvesant. All the schools in Bedford-Stuyvesant were of the oldest in the city. I assume——

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Flacks, you have been a teacher for 20 years, until your dismissal; is that correct?

Mrs. FLACKS. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. At any time during that period of time were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FLACKS. I was fired from the school system for refusing to answer that question. I would like to say here at the time that I was questioned by my district superintendent under the authorization of Dr. Janson, I made it very plain why I refused to answer the question, and it goes back to my years of working in Bedford-Stuyvesant for the new schools that we did finally achieve. It goes back to the years of working with parents, with other teachers——

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. FLACKS. And with the PTA——

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. FLACKS. May I please finish?

Mr. JACKSON. No; that is no response——

Mrs. FLACKS. May I——

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). To the question.

Mrs. FLACKS (continuing). Please finish?

Mr. CLARDY. No; you may not, until we are done.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the witness——

Mr. VELDE. Now, just a minute—would the counsel repeat the question again?

Mr. KUNZIG. The question was: At any time during that 20 years that Mrs. Flacks was in the school system of New York was she a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Again, Mrs. Flacks, I think you have heard the previous two witnesses, and the same rule, the same order, would be in effect relative to your testimony.

Mrs. FLACKS. Well——

Mr. VELDE. Now, will you answer the question "Yes" or "No," put to you by counsel?

Mrs. FLACKS. Well, I will decline to answer it, but I would like to give my reasons——

Mr. VELDE. Well, of course you are——

Mrs. FLACKS. And with your interest in education——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Entitled to legal reasons; but you are way off the subject. You are far afield from any legal reason for refusing to answer the question.

If you would like to confer with counsel——

Mrs. FLACKS. Well, I would like just to take a minute, because I spent many sleepless hours last night, not because I was worried about my job—I lost my job—but because of what happened here yesterday when Mr. Shaw, one of the prominent musicians——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask again——

Mr. VELDE. I must insist, Mrs. Flacks, that you answer the question or give legal grounds for refusing to answer the question.

Mr. CLARDY. May I explain to the witness you must advance legal grounds in your own self-protection. If you decline to do that, you place yourself in jeopardy.

Now, if you have a legal constitutional ground you wish to advance, do so, and do it now.

Mrs. FLACKS. Well, I will decline under my—I certainly take advantage of my constitutional rights and decline under the first amendment, which guarantees me freedom of speech and freedom of thought; under the fifth amendment, which gives me the right not to bear witness against myself; under the sixth amendment, which, if you have any evidence of my wrongdoing, I am certainly entitled to trial by a real judicial body and with legal authority and due process.

Now, I would like to make this statement to tell why I spent those sleepless hours last night.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. I suggest the statement is sufficient that you have already made for refusing to answer the question.

Now, if you had answered the questions, as did the other witnesses, we would allow you to make an explanation of your yes or no answer to the question.

I have one further question: Are you a member of the Communist Party at the present time?

Mrs. FLACKS. Well, I think you are a little naive to think I would answer that, Mr. Velde——

Mr. VELDE. Well——

Mrs. FLACKS (continuing). On the same grounds as previous.

Mr. JACKSON. You decline to answer?

Mrs. FLACKS. I decline to answer, and I wish you would let me state my reasons for not answering, and why.

Mr. VELDE. Well, you have stated your legal reasons.

Mrs. FLACKS. Well, legal reasons, but certainly moral reasons—and I, as an educator——

Mr. VELDE. Sometime when we are not in official proceedings maybe we could listen to you——

Mrs. FLACKS. Well, I——

Mr. VELDE. But we do have a number of witnesses to be heard, and some whom I am sure will give us some very interesting information in an affirmative way.

Mrs. FLACKS. Mine would be very affirmative, Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. You have not been willing to do that for the committee or for your country. So, we cannot take up further time listening to these tirades.

Is there any reason why this witness should be retained under subpoena?

Mr. KUNZIG. There is not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Do any of the members have any further questions to ask this witness?

If not, the witness is excused.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

Mr. VELDE. Call your next witness.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Julius Jacobs.

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn?

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. JACOBS. I do.

Mr. CAMMER. Do you want the lights off?

Mr. JACOBS. May I request the lights be turned off, please?

Mr. VELDE. The lights would bother you in testifying or in giving your testimony?

Mr. JACOBS. They would.

Mr. VELDE. The cameras will desist during the course of the witness' testimony.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let the record show that the witness is accompanied by the same counsel as was present in the last two instances.

#### TESTIMONY OF JULIUS G. JACOBS, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, HAROLD I. CAMMER

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state your full name for the record, please, sir?

Mr. JACOBS. Julius G. Jacobs—J-a-c-o-b-s.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Jacobs, would you give your address, please?

Mr. JACOBS. 729 East 49th Street, Brooklyn 3, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Jacobs, would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background?

Mr. JACOBS. I was educated in the elementary and high schools in Brooklyn. I graduated from the College of the City of New York in 1929 with an A. B. degree. I got my master's degree at City College in 1935. I had taken some courses at Columbia in the interim.

Mr. KUNZIG. What has been your background experience with regard to your employment?

Mr. JACOBS. I've been a teacher of health and physical education now since I was regularly appointed in 1932. I subbed for a term or so before my regular appointment, and I've been teaching health and physical education ever since.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where are you now teaching?

Mr. JACOBS. I teach at Lafayette High School in Brooklyn.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Jacobs, have you ever used an alias?

Mr. JACOBS. I must decline to answer the question on the grounds of the first, fifth, and sixth amendments.

Mr. KUNZIG. You recall the testimony of Mrs. Funn<sup>1</sup> yesterday, under oath, before this committee, in which she said she knew you as a member of the Communist Party and that you were also known by

<sup>1</sup> Dorothy K. Funn.

another name, the name of Jack Johnson, that Jack Johnson and Julius Jacobs are one and the same person.

Did you ever go under the name of Jack Johnson?

Mr. JACOBS. Again I must decline to answer the question on the grounds of the first, fifth, and sixth amendments.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JACOBS. I must decline to answer the questions on the same ground.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JACOBS. I must decline to answer the questions on the same ground.

Mr. KEARNEY. If you were not a member of the Communist Party, would you so state?

Mr. JACOBS. I would invoke the first, fifth, and sixth amendments, sir, because of the many reasons stated by previous witnesses; and I didn't want to take your time with the same answers.

Mr. KEARNEY. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly obvious that this witness is going to be uncooperative, and I have no further questions to ask.

Mr. JACOBS. I am cooperating in the best way I can. I wouldn't say that I am uncooperative.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is a matter of personal opinion.

Mr. JACOBS. I guess so.

Mr. KEARNEY. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. I have no questions.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, in view of Mr. Jacobs' or Mr. Johnson's statement, whichever his name is—

Mr. JACOBS. My name is Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. DOYLE. Jacobs; not Johnson? You haven't been known by that name?

Mr. JACOBS. I refuse to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. In view of your statement that you were trying to cooperate with this committee, I think it is important that we call to your attention this fact: that this committee is here under permanent statutory law, Public Law 601, which charges this committee as a standing committee of your Congress, Mr. Jacobs, with looking into the extent and character of subversive activities in this country.

Now, we are sent here by your Congress of the United States to look into this extent and character and objects of subversive people and groups of people in and around New York, within certain limits. Therefore, we are here officially and we are here under statutory law.

You recognize that, don't you?

Mr. JACOBS. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, if you recognize that we are here officially and under statutory law performing our duty, why don't you feel it is your duty to help this committee by telling us what you know about subversive activities?

Mr. JACOBS. As I understand it, this committee is set up by Congress to recommend legislation, carrying on investigations. I don't feel that I can get a fair opportunity to state what I want to state in view of all the seemingly pressure anyway——

Mr. DOYLE. Well——

Mr. JACOBS. That I feel I am facing.

Mr. DOYLE. You are here with your distinguished counsel, and we are always glad to have lawyers come. You have a perfect freedom to confer with him as to your rights, and we always want that to be true.

Our highest courts have held, the loyalty boards have held, the record appears to show that the American Communist Party and its objectives are subversive.

Now, we are here, therefore, under the assignment of your Congress looking into the extent to which the Communist Party in the United States is subversive.

We have information, under oath, that you have been at least a member of the American Communist Party.

Now, therefore, it just would seem to me, as one American to another, that if you really want to cooperate with your Congress, your own Congress, in its official assignment, the thing for you to do, fairly, it seems to me, as a man teaching the American youth physical education and health, is to come on and tell us what you know about the Communist Party, as to whether or not it is subversive in your judgment, the extent to which it is, how it operates; and, therefore, we think that officially we have a perfect right to ask you if you are a member of the Communist Party.

Now, we don't ask you to violate your conscience in whatever answer you give. I want to make that clear to you. On the other hand, we are here as an official committee of your Congress, and you have stated you recognize that.

Now, then, why don't you cooperate really and tell us what you know about the Communist Party here in New York?

Mr. JACOBS. Well, to really state what my conscience is, I would state that I have always been a loyal American citizen. I have loved children. I have taught them all sorts of athletic activities. I have participated in them—with them in games, and play, and I feel that one of the things that I also always have done is that of upholding the Constitution, and the Constitution states that, under the first, fifth, and sixth amendments, I need not answer these questions in such hearing.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, we are not asking you to incriminate yourself. We are merely asking you to cooperate with the committee, which you recognize, according to your own testimony, as an official committee of your Congress.

Mr. JACOBS. Well, I—excuse me.

Mr. DOYLE. We are here on an express assignment, and our evidence shows clearly that the Communist Party is subversive; and, under oath, we have testimony that you were a member. Therefore, we know we have the official right and it is our duty to ask you to help us in that regard. Why don't you do it?

Mr. JACOBS. I'm doing it in the best manner in which I can possibly do it, and that is that, under the fifth amendment, I do not incrimi-

nate myself. I simply don't bear witness or testimony against myself.

Mr. VELDE. In a criminal action, remember. The fifth amendment also says that.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, of course, if you feel conscientiously having been a member of the Communist Party of America might at some future time develop a situation where you would incriminate yourself, or whatever you say now, I can understand.

Of course, we have evidence—books and books of it—to the effect that the American Communist Party is part and parcel of an international conspiracy.

When I was over in Korea a few months ago for Congress, I asked many American boys whether or not there was any connection between the military, aggressive, Communist attack over in Korea and the American Communist Party in the United States, and they all answered me uniformly. "It is one and the same conspiracy to overthrow the free peoples of the world and their freedom-loving forms of government."

So, I don't have any compunctions, Mr. Jacobs, about asking you, as a teacher in American schools, to come clean and help us—

Mr. JACOBS. I am.

Mr. DOYLE. Because I saw boys dying over there.

Mr. JACOBS. I am clean, sir. I don't have to come clean.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, the—

Mr. CLARDY. If you are not a Communist, why don't you say so?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, the American Communist Party in the United States of America is not clean. It's not patriotic and it's not freedom-loving, in my judgment; and I would think you, as a member of the public school forces, ought to review your own attitude toward the United States Government and toward your own Congress and make very sure you want to continue with that attitude.

Mr. JACOBS. I draw my attitude from the privileges granted me by the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. DOYLE. And we uphold that—

Mr. JACOBS. Which I admire.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Strongly, and we compliment you if you conscientiously plead those amendments.

Mr. JACOBS. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is excused and the committee will stand in recess for 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 11:10 a. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 11:20 a. m., of the same day.)

(The hearing reconvened at 11:20 a. m., the following members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, and Clyde Doyle.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show at this point present are Mr. Kearney, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Doyle, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, a quorum of the full committee.

Call your next witness, Mr. Counsel.



Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Florence Jacobs.

Mr. VELDE. Raise your right hand.

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. JACOBS. I do.

Mr. VELDE. Be seated, please.

Since you object to the lights, will the still photographers take their pictures now before the testimony begins and please desist from taking further pictures, and will the newsreel and television cameras desist?

Mrs. JACOBS. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let the record show the witness is accompanied by counsel, the same attorney as in the past witnesses this morning.

### TESTIMONY OF MRS. FLORENCE H. JACOBS, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, HAROLD I. CAMMER

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state your full name for the record, Mrs. Jacobs?

Mrs. JACOBS. Florence H. Jacobs.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your address, Mrs. Jacobs?

Mrs. JACOBS. 729 East 49th Street, Brooklyn.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you the wife of the previous witness?

Mrs. JACOBS. I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mrs. Jacobs, would you state for the committee your educational background?

Mrs. JACOBS. I went to the elementary and high school in Brooklyn. Then I went to Hunter and Brooklyn College. I took training as a dietitian, hospital training. Then I completed my master's degree at Hunter, at Columbia University.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was that?

Mrs. JACOBS. In—I think it was in 1933; and took some additional courses at NYU. I have taken my alertness courses in my own field.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your employment background?

Mrs. JACOBS. I worked as a substitute at Brooklyn College—I think it was in 1933, and I worked as a dietitian in charge—in hospitals—in several hospitals.

Then I became a substitute teacher in several schools, and then when I was appointed by the board of education I worked about 11 or 12 years as a teacher of health education in hygiene for the board of education.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you employed presently by the board of education?

Mrs. JACOBS. I am employed presently.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where are you employed?

Mrs. JACOBS. At Franklin K. Lane High School.

Mr. KUNZIG. Franklin K.—

Mrs. JACOBS. Lane.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Lane High School?

Mrs. JACOBS. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is the address of that school?

Mrs. JACOBS. It is Jamaica Avenue and Dexter Court, Brooklyn.

Mr. KUNZIG. Brooklyn.

What do you teach there now, Mrs. Jacobs?

Mrs. JACOBS. I teach health education, which is physical activities, hygiene, dance work.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you heard the testimony of Mrs. Funn<sup>1</sup> yesterday that she knew you as one of those who attended the New York State Communist Party school with her. Did you ever attend the New York State Communist Party school?

Mrs. JACOBS. I decline to answer that question on the basis of the basis of the first amendment, which grants me the privilege of freedom of thought and association; on the basis of the sixth amendment, which grants me the privilege of trial and cross-examination of a witness who may have accused me of anything; on the basis of the fifth amendment, where I do not wish to bear testimony against myself.

Mr. VELDE. Well, I should like to explain for the record——

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. I don't think you have interpreted——

Mr. KUNZIG. That's right.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). The various amendments you quoted to rely upon properly. However, you are relying on all of the protections of the amendments you mentioned to the Constitution; is that correct?

Mrs. JACOBS. That's right.

Mr. VELDE. And you do refuse to answer the question put to you by counsel?

Mrs. JACOBS. I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. I was going to state, sir, I think the record should show there is no right of cross-examination. That is an incorrect statement of law as made by the witness.

Mrs. JACOBS. I did not make that statement—that the congressional committee has the right to cross-examine witnesses. I stated that I declined to answer the question here because I do not have the right here——

Mr. KUNZIG. Right.

Mrs. JACOBS. To cross examine witnesses.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Mrs. Jacobs, the October 3, 1944, issue of the Daily Worker, page 6, lists a group of people to whom one may report to get out the American Labor Party vote. It lists for Bay Ridge a Florence Jacobs, 4714 Fifth Avenue. Are you that Florence Jacobs?

Mrs. JACOBS. I didn't hear the address.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, I will pass it over to you and you may look at it. It is marked for identification as "Florence Jacobs Exhibit No. 1."

Mrs. JACOBS. I am not that Florence Jacobs.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. JACOBS. I decline to answer that on the basis of the first, fifth, and sixth amendments, as I answered before.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. JACOBS. I also decline to answer that on those same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. No further questions, sir, if the witness is going to be uncooperative.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

<sup>1</sup> Dorothy K. Funn.

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

(No response.)

Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I have 1 or 2.

I assume, Mrs. Jacobs, you were in the room here yesterday—I think I saw you here—

Mrs. JACOBS. Yes; I was.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). While Mrs. Funn was testifying—

Mrs. JACOBS. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). You and your husband.

Mrs. JACOBS. We were subpoenaed to be here.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you were here and heard her testimony—

Mrs. JACOBS. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. And you heard her testimony that the Communist Party held a secret school here in the State of New York, at which she attended. Did you hear her so testify?

Mrs. JACOBS. I did.

Mr. DOYLE. And you heard her testify that was a secret school and was kept very much in the dark and kept very much secretive, did you not?

Mrs. JACOBS. I heard it.

Mr. DOYLE. And you heard her testify also you attended that secret school?

Mrs. JACOBS. I heard her.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you attend the school?

Mrs. JACOBS. Well, I decline to answer that on the same grounds as I have given before.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that is all.

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason why this witness should be retained under subpoena?

Mr. KUNZIG. No reason, sir.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. VELDE. Call the next witness, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Arnaud D'Usseau.

Mr. VELDE. Will you call the witness again?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think I saw him coming forward.

Mr. Arnaud D'Usseau.

Is he present in the courtroom?

Mr. VELDE. Spell out the name, will you, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. A-r-n-a-u-d D-'U-s-s-e-a-u.

Possibly I did not pronounce it correctly.

If he is not here, I will call another witness.

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute. Maybe we better look in the hall to find out whether he is out there in the waiting audience.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Fuoss, will you look in the hall?

I understand counsel is not available at the moment.

Mr. VELDE. You mean the witness is not available?

Mr. CAMMER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Do you represent this witness?

Mr. CAMMER. No, your honor. The attorney is arguing a motion in court this morning, and asking this morning if you will call—to please ask you to hold it for a half hour or so until he gets here. He will be along.

Mr. VELDE. Who is this counsel?

Mr. CAMMER. I think it is Mr. Franse.

Mr. VELDE. And he told you he was representing this witness?

Mr. CAMMER. From Mr. Franse, that is my recollection of it.

Mr. VELDE. Has he attempted to get in touch with you, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. This is the first I have known of the situation. I am confident I have not heard from counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. Or the witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Or the witness.

Mr. CAMMER. Well, he will be along. He has a matter in court.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the witness here?

Mr. CAMMER. I really don't know, sir. I don't know the witness.

Mr. VELDE. Well, of course, the counsel have been here and they have been available at all times—counsel for the committee—and you realize, as a member of the bar, naturally it is the duty of counsel for the witness to get in touch with our counsel, and apparently that has not happened. So, I think we should proceed to introduce the subpoena.

Mr. CLARDY. He places himself in jeopardy, as you know.

Mr. CAMMER. Well, in a sense, it was thought the teachers were going to occupy all morning.

Mr. VELDE. Well, if you are not counsel, Mr. Cammer, for this witness that is called, will you please be seated?

Mr. TAVENNER. In this particular case, if the witness is in the room, or someone knows his counsel, I wish to state that the witness will be given until this afternoon at approximately 2 o'clock to appear before taking further proceedings.

Mr. VELDE. Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Mortimer Offner.

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn?

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. OFFNER. I do.

Mr. Chairman, I prefer to have the lights off during my testimony. It will make me feel a good deal more comfortable.

Mr. VELDE. Would it assist any in getting the witness to answer the questions put to him by counsel?

Mr. OFFNER. Well, it certainly would assist me in answering.

Mr. VELDE. All right; the same order is in effect as has been in effect with regard to the previous witnesses.

Mr. OFFNER. I would also like the press, the still cameras, to desist in taking photographs during the testimony.

# TESTIMONY OF MORTIMER OFFNER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, MARTIN POPPER

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. OFFNER. Mortimer Offner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. OFFNER. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your first and last name, please?

Mr. OFFNER. M-o-r-t-i-m-e-r O-f-f-n-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are accompanied by counsel?

Mr. OFFNER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. POPPER. The name is Martin Popper—P-o-p-p-e-r—New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Offner?

Mr. OFFNER. In the city of New York on November 3, 1900.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. OFFNER. I am a director—theatrical director—television director.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, briefly what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. OFFNER. I went through the New York City public schools, attended the University of Chicago and Columbia University, from which I was graduated with a degree of bachelor of arts.

That's the extent of my formal education, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what the nature of your employment or occupation has been since 1935?

Mr. OFFNER. In 1935 I was in Hollywood, employed as a writer in the motion-picture industry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, when did you begin your employment as a writer in the motion-picture industry in Hollywood?

Mr. OFFNER. In the year 1933, I believe it was, in the late part of that year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go to Hollywood from New York—

Mr. OFFNER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Or how long had you been in Hollywood in 1933?

Mr. OFFNER. I had been there for—since the early part of the year.

Mr. TAVENNER. And how long did you continue your work as a writer in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. OFFNER. I was a writer in the motion-picture industry until approximately—until approximately the end of 1943, when I entered the Army.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what some of your principal screen credits were during that period?

Mr. OFFNER. Yes. I worked as a writer on several films, notably Little Minister, Alice Adams, a picture called Silvia Scarlet, a picture called Quality Street, a picture called Radio City Revels, a picture called The Saint in New York and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Since 1943 what has been your employment, and where?

Mr. OFFNER. My employment since 1943—well, I was in the Army for 3½ years, where I worked chiefly on training films.

When I came back from the Army, I went back to Hollywood in the spring of 1946, where I again was employed sporadically as a writer in the film industry.

Mr. TAVENNER. And over what period of time did you continue your work as a writer after returning there in 1946?

Mr. OFFNER. Over what period of time?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. OFFNER. Until approximately the summer of 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were your principal screen credits during that period of time?

Mr. OFFNER. During that period I had no screen credits. I worked on pictures that were unproduced.

Mr. TAVENNER. And since 1950 what has been your profession and where have you been employed?

Mr. OFFNER. Since 1950 I've been employed in New York as a television producer, director, and also as a theatrical director.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are possibly familiar with the fact that the committee has, since 1951, been conducting a rather extensive investigation within the entertainment field, particularly in Hollywood, for the purpose of determining to what extent the Communist Party has been successful in penetrating the various organizations there which have to do with the moving-picture industry, and especially to become informed of the principal objectives of the Communist Party in Hollywood and the methods by which the Communist Party has endeavored to accomplish those objectives.

During the course of this investigation your name has come before the committee on several occasions. It appears that witnesses have testified to facts which, if their testimony is correct, would place you as a member of the Communist Party somewhere between the years 1936 and 1937 and 1943, at least.

Now, I want to refer to the testimony of several of the witnesses who would bear that out as the basis for some questions to you, with the hope that you will take it up from that point and give the committee such information as you can regarding the operations of the Communist Party in Hollywood.

Let me ask you: Are you acquainted with Mr. Leo Townsend?

Mr. OFFNER. You are referring, I take it, to the stool-pigeon screen-writer that testified before this committee in Hollywood?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; I am not, Mr. Witness. I am speaking of a man who has been a very loyal American and who has come to the aid of his country and this committee by giving this committee the facts within his knowledge.

Mr. OFFNER. Well, I refuse to answer your question on the grounds that it would be degrading to connect myself in any way with such a man—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

Mr. OFFNER. And because I will not bear witness against myself, and—

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute, Mr. Witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. The ground that the witness has cited, as has been decided by the Supreme Court, is not a legal ground, and I ask the witness be directed to answer the question.

Mr. OFFNER. I think I just did answer the question, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. VELDE. Either answer the question with a "Yes" or "No" answer or refuse to answer it on legal grounds.

Mr. OFFNER. I decline to answer it on the grounds that I will not be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. I didn't hear that. I beg your pardon.

Mr. OFFNER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. He didn't say it.

Mr. VELDE. No; he didn't say it.

Mr. POPPER. Yes; he said it.

Mr. SCHERER. I couldn't hear it.

Mr. OFFNER. I said it, but while I was interrupted. I am sorry nobody was listening very carefully.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Offner, the testimony of Mr. Townsend<sup>1</sup> before the committee on September 18, 1951, identified you as having been a member of the Communist Party in the same group of which he was a member, and this question was asked:

Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Mortimer Offner?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; I was. At one time shortly before I left the Communist Party—I think this must have been late in 1947—

And, incidentally, I must have been mistaken when I referred to 1943 as being the last date.

\* \* \* I think this must have been late in 1947—in the early part of 1948, I was serving as an officer of the branch I was in at that time. I was financial director. My duty was to collect dues and assessments from the members of the branch and to turn them over to—I believe the title was—the section financial director, and this section financial director was Mr. Offner. I turned the money over to him. Where it went from there, I don't know. I suppose the county office, and then I suppose from there to the national office.

Now, the committee has been endeavoring to trace the huge amount of funds that were paid the Communist Party by high-salaried people employed in Hollywood.

Mr. Max Silver, who was the organizational secretary of the Communist Party in Los Angeles County, has testified before this committee that the funds did not go through channels. They did not go through the county organization and, in his judgment, came directly to New York under some financial plan of the party.

Now, if this testimony is correct about your having occupied the position as sectional financial director and the collections having been turned over to you, you can give this committee some information that it desires to have and needs.

Now, will you give it to us?

Mr. OFFNER. This committee has stated, I believe, that it has come to New York to investigate subversive activities in the theaters?

Is that so?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer my question?

Mr. OFFNER. Well, I am answering it.

I have some experience of the investigations in Hollywood, having lived there and having followed what went on there, and I believe there's been some 6 or 7 years or more of investigation of so-called subversive activities in the motion-picture industry.

<sup>1</sup> Leo Townsend.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, the witness is not answering the question.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. Again we are not interested in a tirade of extraneous explanation like that. Your opinion of the committee may be given some time when one of the members has a lot of time outside of this session. We might listen to you then——

Mr. OFFNER. Well, what is the question——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). To what you have to say then——

Mr. OFFNER. Exactly, please?

Mr. VELDE (continuing). But while you are in session, the authorized session of this committee, which must proceed with the important work that we are trying to do——

Mr. OFFNER. Well, don't you think it is germane to the question to inquire into the nature of this inquiry and to talk about it?

I think it is.

Mr. VELDE. Well, I think you have heard time and time again, as Mr. Doyle has explained to several witnesses, the authority the committee has to make investigations and report back to Congress, the House of Representatives, for remedial legislation regarding subversive activities in this country, and that is what we are doing at the present time——

Mr. OFFNER. That is what I am commenting upon, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Trying to find out the facts from you——

Mr. OFFNER. I am commenting upon that.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Relative to subversive activities in this country.

I believe you could be of great help to the committee if you were patriotic and loyal to this country.

Mr. OFFNER. I am trying——

Mr. VELDE. Will you answer the question as put to you by counsel?

Mr. OFFNER. What was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was whether you would aid this committee by giving it such information as you have about the handling of funds in the Communist Party in Los Angeles.

Mr. OFFNER. Well, it is a question of understanding what aiding the committee is.

The committee has been investigating for years out in Hollywood and hasn't disclosed one single instance of subversion——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OFFNER. In the motion picture industry.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, again the witness is not answering the question and I ask that last remark be stricken from the record and he be instructed to answer directly.

Mr. OFFNER. Well, I decline to answer this question for——

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, will you please subside until the chairman answers?

Mr. OFFNER. Well, I will decline to answer the question for the reason that, in the first place, I don't believe the committee is performing the function that it says it is——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OFFNER. Having never uncovered a single instance of subversion——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, again——



Mr. VELDE. Mr. Witness, I ask you to answer the question.

Mr. OFFNER. And for the reason that to——

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute. We will have to ask you to answer the question yes or no, or refuse to answer the question on legal grounds—whatever you prefer to do. We can not sit and listen to this tirade and argument.

Mr. OFFNER. It is not a tirade. It is a statement of fact, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. It is a typical Communist tirade now.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I think, though, in view of the——

Mr. VELDE. Let me again make a statement to the audience: That the next time there is a demonstration of any kind the officer will be instructed to remove those responsible for the demonstration.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I think that the witness——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I think the witness' voluntary statement that the committee has not uncovered a single subversive activity or incident—assuming, Witness, that you are in good faith making that statement—and, of course, I do assume that—it just shows how very, very poorly informed you are.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Doyle, I don't assume he did make it in good faith.

Mr. DOYLE. Well——

Mr. OFFNER. I believe——

Mr. VELDE. Let us proceed with it.

Mr. OFFNER. I believe there has been no instance of a motion picture cited that had any subversive material in it.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask——

Mr. OFFNER. And I believe that——

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). That he be directed to answer the question and refrain from arguing.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. I see no reason why we can be gaining any knowledge from this witness by arguing with him.

Mr. CLARDY. None at all.

Mr. VELDE. I think the record will speak for itself, and I ask the counsel to proceed.

Mr. OFFNER. Well, I decline to answer the question on the previous grounds—that I will not be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Elizabeth Wilson testified before the committee and told the committee how she had been a member of the Communist Party and had withdrawn from it, and the reasons for withdrawing from it. She stated during the period of 1947 and 1948 she had reaffiliated with the group. There was a period of time when she was away, or was not a member, and then she reaffiliated with this group. She was asked to name those who were active in that group. She gave the names of a number of persons—Jack [John Howard] Lawson, as one of them; Lester Cole; Melvin Levy, who has testified and admitted his former part in the Communist Party membership, and that he had withdrawn; George Beck, who also testified before the committee and gave the facts within his knowledge, and he, too, had withdrawn from the Communist Party; and she gave your name.

Did you belong to any group of the Communist Party, of which Mrs. Wilson was a member—Mrs. Elizabeth Wilson?

Mr. OFFNER. Well, this is the same old question, Mr. Counsel, in another shape. You know perfectly well I'm going to decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; but I am going to give you the privilege of doing it.

Mr. OFFNER. I believe that the privilege of doing it is a misnomer. I believe you are giving me the privilege of being an un-American by answering any questions of that sort. The first amendment—

Mr. CLARDY. Are you declining?

Mr. OFFNER. I certainly am declining, on the grounds of the first amendment, which allows me freedom of thought and which is very important for the protection of the American theater and the motion-picture industry—

Mr. KEARNEY. In your opinion—

Mr. OFFNER (continuing). Which is very close to my heart. I've spent all my life in them, and on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. In your opinion, is Mrs. Wilson a stool pigeon, as you designated Mr. Townsend?

Mr. OFFNER. Is, in my opinion, Mrs. Wilson a stool pigeon?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. OFFNER. I think Mrs. Wilson is an unfortunate, despicable type of person. I'll put it that way.

Mr. DOYLE. You evidently know her pretty well, according to your opinion.

Mr. OFFNER. I said nothing about knowing her.

Mr. DOYLE. How can you give that judgment of a fellow citizen unless you know her?

Why do you volunteer such an opinion, or such an intolerant attitude, toward an American citizen?

Mr. OFFNER. I think—

Mr. DOYLE. You don't want them to have that intolerant attitude against you?

Mr. OFFNER. It is a matter of public record, Mr. Congressman, what Mrs. Wilson did. It's there for everybody to read.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, don't you allow other Americans to have the same right that you claim for yourself?

Mr. OFFNER. I certainly do, and I wish this committee—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, why—

Mr. OFFNER (continuing). Would stick by that principle.

Mr. DOYLE. Why, then, judge a fellow American the way you judged her, just because she differed with you?

Mr. JACKSON. She exercised freedom of speech probably.

Mr. DOYLE. Surely.

Mr. CLARDY. You don't like that when other people exercise it, do you?

Mr. OFFNER. I love it, and I wish this committee would permit me to exercise it.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, may I say this for the committee: I, for one member of the committee—and I don't know of any other member of the committee who differs with me—don't contend for 1 minute when a witness conscientiously pleads or offers the constitutional protection that our great Constitution gives that person is un-American, when it is conscientiously given. I wish to make that clear to this witness.

We compliment a witness who conscientiously pleads the privilege of the Constitution; but, of course, generally, we have learned, as a result of our many years of work, that most witnesses who at least come before us and plead the constitutional provision, knowing their background and knowing that they have been members of the Communist Party at least, that it is the Communist line from Moscow and they don't plead the constitutional protection in good faith.

I am saying that as to most of the witnesses that plead the constitutional provision before this committee.

Mr. OFFNER. Yes. I know that this committee has tried to give the use of the fifth amendment and the constitutional privilege a very bad name.

Mr. DOYLE. Not at all.

Mr. OFFNER. Yes; I think you've just shown that—

Mr. DOYLE. Not at all.

Mr. OFFNER (continuing). And trying to make it appear that everybody who appeals to it is, by that very token, suspect; and we know very well that the fifth amendment was made for the protection of the innocent—

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Witness—

Mr. OFFNER (continuing). And not for any other reason.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Let me ask you again to answer the questions put to you—

Mr. OFFNER. Well—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). By counsel and members of the committee—

Mr. OFFNER. Very well.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Or refuse to answer them on legal grounds. We are not interested in hearing any more of your opinions which are not based on any facts, any reasonable facts, at all.

Will you proceed?

Mr. OFFNER. Mr. Doyle was carrying on a conversation with me. I thought it was my privilege to answer him.

Mr. JACKSON. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Regular order, and proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Melvin Levy, in his testimony of March 28, 1952, also identified you as a member of the Communist Party.

Were you a member of the Communist Party along with Mr. Levy?

Mr. OFFNER. Mr. Counsel, I think you know what my answer to that is. You are asking me the same question over and over again.

Mr. KEARNEY. Why don't you give—

Mr. OFFNER. It is the same old question and the same attempt to smear me, and the same attempt that has been used to smear 500 people in Hollywood, or more, and do them out of their jobs—

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. OFFNER (continuing). Which is the only thing—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). I suggest—

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. OFFNER. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds—same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Martin Berkeley, in his testimony of January 29, 1952, also identified you as having been a member of the Communist Party back at a period as early as 1939.

Were you a member of any Communist Party group in 1939—

Mr. OFFNER. I'll decline—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). In Hollywood?

Mr. OFFNER (continuing). To answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. How is that?

Mr. OFFNER. I will decline to answer that question, as I have declined to answer questions in which evidence has been brought forward here by stoolpigeons and un-Americans—

Mr. KEARNEY. And despicable characters?

Mr. OFFNER (continuing). And I will decline to do so on the grounds I will not bear witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. OFFNER. You're asking the same question. It's the refrain that this committee carries on and on and on, and I hope you're not going to succeed in intimidating the theatrical industry here—

Mr. VELDE. Please answer the question—

Mr. OFFNER (continuing). In the same way—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Or refuse to answer it.

Mr. OFFNER (continuing). You intimidated it in Hollywood.

I refuse to answer it on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. No.

Just one observation, however, Mr. Chairman: The witness is correct in stating that over 500 members of what has been found in the highest court in the land to be an international conspiracy have been disclosed within that industry.

It also should be pointed out for the record that several millions of dollars, the total sum of which is not known, were channeled into the coffers of the Communist Party for what purposes are not known.

So, this investigation at this time, I believe, within the entertainment field, has produced a great deal of valuable information as far as recruitment and physical operations of the Communist Party is concerned.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHIERER. Mr. Offner, did you ever receive any compensation from the Communist Party?

Mr. OFFNER. I decline to answer the question—

Mr. SCHIERER. Did you ever pass—

Mr. OFFNER (continuing). On the same grounds.

Mr. SCHIERER. Did you ever pass on any funds to the Communist Party?

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. OFFNER. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHIERER. All right. Have you ever been an agent for the Communist Party?

Mr. OFFNER. What do you mean by that?

Mr. SCHERER. Just what the word "agent" means, Mr. Offner.

Mr. OFFNER. Well, there are theatrical agents.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes. An agent in any capacity.

Mr. OFFNER. I think you will have to make that question more definite.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, my question—

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Officer (addressing an officer of the court), I think you are a new officer here. I have previously instructed the audience here that any disturbance would not be tolerated, and I asked if such disturbance is caused that you find the persons responsible for that disturbance and remove them from the hearing room. If that happens again, that order will be in effect.

Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you ever been an agent of the Communist Party—

Mr. OFFNER. Well, I—

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). In any capacity?

Mr. OFFNER. You are asking me the same question in another form—have I ever been a member of the Communist Party. Is that what you are asking?

Mr. SCHERER. No; I am not asking you if you were ever a member. I am asking if you had been an agent of the Communist Party.

You have been in the theatrical business—

Mr. OFFNER. Yes; I know what the term is.

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). And you are a graduate of Columbia. You know what the word "agent" means.

Mr. OFFNER. I don't know what the word "agent" means in this connection. You will have to define it. "Agent" means somebody acted for. It has a very broad connotation.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, a financial secretary is an agent, isn't he?

(No response.)

Mr. SCHERER. Well, are you a financial secretary of the Communist Party?

Mr. OFFNER. Well, now, I see the point of your question.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. OFFNER. I have already refused to answer that question on the grounds—

Mr. SCHERER. Well, were you an agent in any other capacity, other than a financial secretary, Mr. Offner?

Mr. OFFNER. Well, what do you mean by that?

I wish you would be definite.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, did you act in any capacity for the Communist Party?

Mr. OFFNER. Well, it's the same old refrain. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. All right. Have you ever been an agent of the Russian Government, then?

(At this point Mr. Offner conferred with Mr. Popper.)

Mr. OFFNER. Well, I would ask for a definition of that, too. What do you mean by that? What are you driving at?

I don't understand the question.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you ever acted for the Russian Government in any capacity whatsoever?

Mr. OFFNER. No; I have not.

Mr. SCHERER. That is all.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I think, Mr. Chairman, in view of this witness' answers that it is timely for me to get into the record here and for the hearing of the large group of folks here for their information the fact that not only does this committee operate under Public Law 601, which I have referred to several times in these hearings, but that the Internal Security Act of 1950, passed by the United States Congress as Public Law 831, designated commonly as the Subversive Activities Control Act, reads in part as follows—and I wish to just call attention to two paragraphs of it—and I know the witness is well aware of and well informed about it—I assume that:

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Congress hereby finds that (1) there exists a world Communist movement which, in its origin, its development, and its present practice, is a worldwide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups, governmental and otherwise, espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in this country and throughout the world through a medium of a worldwide Communist organization.

The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the subordination of the rights of individuals to the State, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by a Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Now, manifestly, Mr. Chairman, I haven't read all of this act; but I felt those three paragraphs were especially pertinent to bring to the witness' attention and the attention of any others that might hear or read this at this time.

Now, may I say, Mr. Offner, in view of your remark that not a single incident of any moving picture in Hollywood or other places have been found subversive, in view of your statement to that effect, of course, our investigation of subversive activities in Hollywood or any place else has not been limited to whether or not there happened to be any moving picture that was inherently subversive. We haven't been investigating exclusively that field.

I have no other question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason why this witness should be continued under subpoena?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. If not, the witness is dismissed.

The committee will stand in recess until 1:30.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p. m., of the same day.)

## AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 1:31 p. m., of the same day, the hearing was resumed, the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Bernard W. Kearney, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show that Mr. Kearney, Mr. Clary, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, are present, a quorum of the committee.

The Chair would like to make an announcement relative to the testimony which was scheduled to take place immediately after we reconvened this afternoon.

The next witness was to be Mrs. Abe Burrows. Since she has been subpoenaed, we have received information that she is in care of a medical doctor and that it is possible that a public hearing of her testimony would cause her some discomfort, inconvenience, and may be possibly injurious to her health.

The committee is always anxious to assist any witness who comes before this committee and will, of course, do nothing which will be injurious to a witness' health; and, so, the committee met in executive session and decided that Mrs. Burrows would be called in executive session later on in the day and then her testimony would be released to the public later on.<sup>1</sup>

So, we will proceed, Mr. Counsel, with the next witness.

Will you call the next witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, before the next witness is called, I think I owe the committee and Mr. Franse, who is counsel for the witness who was called this morning and who was absent, an apology. It develops counsel called us on Friday or Saturday of last week and advised of a hearing that he had in court this morning.

Mr. VELDE. He is counsel for which witness now?

Mr. TAVENNER. For the witness, Arnaud D'Usseau.

I agreed with him that the witness would be called this afternoon instead of this morning. A notation of that was made in the investigator's file, but not in my file and I overlooked it.

Mr. VELDE. Well, of course, Mr. Counsel, your apology as far as the committee is concerned, I am sure, is accepted. We realize the strain under which you are operating and realize those mistakes are possible to be made, and I am sure the counsel and the witness have not suffered any inconvenience by reason of our calling him this morning instead of this afternoon as you have promised.

Now, will you proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Cedric Belfrage.

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand, Mr. Belfrage?

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I do.

Mr. VELDE. Be seated, please.

<sup>1</sup> Testimony given in executive session by Mrs. Abe Burrows appears on pp. 1327-1328 of this publication.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Am I permitted to object to the battery of lights here, Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Does the witness feel it will disturb——

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). His testimony?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. If we would be assured the witness would answer the questions put to him by counsel in case we ordered the lights turned off and the television cameras——

Mr. BELFRAGE. I would appreciate it if they were turned off, sir.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Would you then answer the questions that are put to you by counsel?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I don't know what the questions are going to be; but I—I protest against having to sit here in front of this battery of lights—it is very disturbing indeed—and being photographed by people all the time while I am giving testimony.

Mr. VELDE. It has been the rule of the committee, of course, where there has been an objection to being photographed by the newsreel and television cameras that that objection will be observed in the interest of securing cooperation from the witness who makes the objection; and, so, I will ask that the television cameras and the newreel lights be turned off and cease and desist.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see, Mr. Belfrage, you are accompanied by counsel. Would counsel please state his name and address for the record?

Mr. DAMBROFF. Yes. Nathan Dambroff, 38 Park Row, New York.

### TESTIMONY OF CEDRIC HENNING BELFRAGE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, NATHAN DAMBROFF

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give your name, please, and spell it correctly so we get it right?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Cedric Henning Belfrage—C-e-d-r-i-c H-e-n-n-i-n-g B-e-l-f-r-a-g-e.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Belfrage, could you give the committee a résumé of your educational background?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Well, it is not a very long story. I went to an English public school—that is a private school—and Cambridge University and Grenoble University in France.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where were you born, Mr. Belfrage?

Mr. BELFRAGE. In London, England.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you at the present time an American citizen?

Mr. BELFRAGE. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where do you have citizenship or of what country are you a subject?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Great Britain.

Mr. KUNZIG. Great Britain?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. How long have you been in this country? When did you first enter?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I first entered in April—I believe it was April—I have the date down here; I have some notes—no; I don't have that date—approximately April of 1926.



Mr. KUNZIG. Have you stayed ever since then?

Mr. BELFRAGE. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. I presume, there have been many ins and outs?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Travel back and forth a great deal.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was the last time you traveled back to Europe?

Mr. BELFRAGE. The last time I entered——

Mr. KUNZIG. Or entered?

Mr. BELFRAGE. October 28, 1945.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have been in this country continuously since 1945?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Correct; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé of your employment background and military record?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I must decline to answer that question under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. You decline to answer a question as to your employment and your military record?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask he be directed to reply to the question.

Mr. VELDE. Well, yes; I think you should be directed, but first let me ask: What part of the fifth amendment do you rely upon, Mr. Belfrage?

Mr. BELFRAGE. That part which makes it impossible for anyone to make me bear witness against myself.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would testifying as to your military service make you bear witness against yourself?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the British forces?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. VELDE. Well, the Chair——

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of any of the Allied forces?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer the question, sir, on the ground——under the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of any of the enemy forces?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. VELDE. Well, let me say before you are directed to answer the question put to you by counsel and Mr. Kearney, that the Chair—and I am sure other members of the committee—can see no reasonable way in which you can use the fifth amendment to excuse you from answering the question relative to your educational background or your employment background. There might be possibly something in your military background, especially if you have been in the armed forces of an enemy, that might tend to incriminate you. I don't know what it would be right now; but in your employment background, certainly I can see no reasonable way in which you can incriminate yourself.

So, I wish you would reconsider answering questions at least as to your employment.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. DAMBROFF. May I have——

Mr. VELDE. You may consult.

Mr. DAMBROFF (continuing). A word with him, please?

Mr. VELDE. Certainly.

Mr. KUNZIG. Surely.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. My counsel instructs me that I can—I can freely answer as to the general nature of my work in England, and since I came here.

I have been a magazine writer, a writer in general, for various forms of publication, and since I came here I have been prosecuting similar ends.

Mr. KEARNEY. I didn't understand that.

Mr. BELFRAGE. I have been doing the same. I am in general a writer.

Mr. VELDE. May I suggest to counsel that if he has some information, further information, to ask, you make your questions a little more specific in the general background.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, I think we should.

Mr. CLARDY. May I make a suggestion, too, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. That he take up first his employment out of this country, because obviously nothing that has transpired, criminal or otherwise, outside of the jurisdiction of the courts of this land, can in any way incriminate him here, and then take his step by step on that employment when out of the country before you get to his employment here.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you, then, Mr. Belfrage, give the committee a résumé of your employment prior to your coming to this country?

Mr. BELFRAGE. My employment—

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE (continuing). It is quite a long—

Mr. KUNZIG. To the best of your knowledge.

Mr. BELFRAGE. It is quite a long one.

Well, you are referring to salaried employment, I guess, because I haven't had very many salaried employments in my life; but I can give you those.

Mr. KUNZIG. You can list those. You might also mention publications for which you have written, and so forth.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Well, I have written for a great many magazines, a great many fan magazines, about the motion pictures. That was my work for a number of years.

Mr. KUNZIG. This was prior to coming to this country?

Mr. BELFRAGE. No; in this country and—

Mr. KUNZIG. Let's take it first prior to coming to this country.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Prior to coming to this country, I wrote for a magazine, I think, called the Picture Goer, as I recall it, in London, and another one called, I think, the Bioscope, trade publication—various such publications—some of them probably not—don't exist any more.

Mr. KUNZIG. What period of time would this have been?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Oh, this would have been before I came here—before 1926.

Mr. KUNZIG. After you came to this country, what employment have you had, either salaried or employment in the sense of writing for magazines, motion pictures, whatever you may have done?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Since I came here?

Mr. KUNZIG. Since you came to this country.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Well, I wrote for further—I further wrote for fan magazines about the motion pictures. I used to go and interview movie stars in Beverly Hills, and so forth.

Mr. KUNZIG. What period of time would this have been?

Mr. BELFRAGE. 1927 to about 1930, in general. I did a little more of it later, when I was there again.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any other?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Well, then, after that, I—I went back to England as a representative for Mr. Samuel Goldwyn in London, and I had that—that was a salaried appointment.

Mr. KUNZIG. What period of time would this have been?

Mr. BELFRAGE. That was in 1930, and in 1931.

Mr. SCHERER. What type of work did you do for Mr. Goldwyn in England?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Publicity work, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Did the gentleman say from England?

Mr. SCHERER. In England.

Mr. BELFRAGE. In England.

Mr. VELDE. Was that in England?

Mr. BELFRAGE. In England; yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I'm sorry.

Mr. KUNZIG. Publicizing—

Mr. BELFRAGE. Publicizing pictures.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any other employment now, leaving out the war years?

I am coming to that.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Well, after I left—when I was with Mr. Goldwyn, I was invited to join the London Daily and Sunday Express as a movie critic, and I was in that—I was in that employment for about 5 years—the movie critic, theater critic, and columnist.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any other employments that you had, or any other type of work that you did in this period since you came to America?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Since I came to America—well, I came back to America and I was doing general writing. I was not employed prior to the war.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you become employed by the National Guardian?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to—reluctantly compelled to—assert my rights under the fifth amendment. I cannot answer that question because you, yourself, have been quoted in the Congressional Record as stating that the National Guardian is another propaganda arm of Soviet Russia, and Representative Dondero and Representative Gross have made similar statements in the Congress.

Mr. VELDE. Well, is it?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I refuse to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. VELDE. Well, now, you have mentioned that you felt compelled to decline to answer. Let me state you don't have to decline. You are under no compulsion to answer this question.

Do you refuse or decline to answer the question?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question; yes, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Furthermore, I would like to say that the very question that has been put to me in the context of the statement that you have, yourself, made in the Congress and other Congressmen have made make it apparent that I have been summoned here for the purpose of abridging the freedom of the press by—by abridging the rights of the National Guardian, and which would be an abridgement of the freedom of the press under the first Constitution—under the first amendment to the United States Constitution.

Mr. CLARDY. Of course, Mr. Chairman, that isn't so, and I move to strike those remarks from the record.

Mr. VELDE. Well, of course, the witness has the right to rely on the first amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. I meant that explanatory—

Mr. BELFRAGE. Sir, I have—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Diatribe.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; I agree with you.

Mr. BELFRAGE. The National Guardian has been prejudged by yourself.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you know whether or not it is subversive?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SCHIERER. Well, if it were subversive, would it be an abridgment of the freedom of the press?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. SCHIERER. Well, isn't it obvious if it were subversive—

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer any questions along that line on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEARNEY. May I ask—

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle wants the floor, but go ahead, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. I—

Mr. DOYLE. I have not made any statement about the National Guardian.

Mr. BELFRAGE. I see.

Mr. DOYLE. What is the National Guardian—

Mr. BELFRAGE. I—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). To which you voluntarily referred?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I suggest—

Mr. DOYLE. What is the National Guardian?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I suggest you could ask that question of Mr. Velde, sir. He apparently—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, are you connected with it?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Is it a publication of some sort?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I have read about it.

I decline to answer any question about it at all.

Mr. DOYLE. Does it use any of the press services like the Associated Press or the United Press or the International News Service?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I can't answer these questions, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know what the answer is?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I can't answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. Why?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I cannot—I—I demand my rights under the fifth amendment—

Mr. DOYLE. Well—

Mr. BELFRAGE. Not to testify against myself—

Mr. DOYLE. Well—

Mr. BELFRAGE. And I have been prejudged by members of this—certain members of this—committee sitting right here.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, do you believe it would incriminate you under the fifth amendment, which says “\* \* \* nor shall he be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself”?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Well, Mr. Velde—

Mr. DOYLE. Would it—

Mr. BELFRAGE. Mr. Velde—

Mr. DOYLE. Would it—

Mr. BELFRAGE. Mr. Velde has said so.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, let me ask my questions, please.

Would it possibly incriminate you to answer this question as to whether or not this National Guardian uses any of the established news services? Would that possibly incriminate you?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer those question, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you filed your application for citizenship papers?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question, Mr. Doyle, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Would it possibly incriminate you if you had filed your first citizenship application papers to become a citizen of the Nation in which you have lived and prospered since 1945?

Would it incriminate you if you became a citizen of the United States?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Under the circumstances, sir, since I have been prejudged, I decline to answer that question on the ground of the fifth amendment, which is the shield of the innocent and it is this innocence which I seek to protect.

Mr. DOYLE. Why haven't you filed first citizenship papers in my country since 1945?

You said you lived here continuously.

Mr. BELFRAGE. I must decline to answer, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. DOYLE. I think you ought to go back to some other country if you don't think enough of the United States to file for citizenship papers.

Mr. VELDE. There will be no demonstrations.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Sir, I wish to state in asserting my rights under the fifth amendment I am neither admitting or denying the question which you ask.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not saying you are, but I am saying any man who has come to my country and been here since 1945, and engages in newspaper work of any kind, and has earned his livelihood in the United States of America, ought to think enough of it to make his first application for citizenship papers, and I am talking and looking straight at you, sir.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Mr. Doyle, it is your privilege to make that statement, and I think I think just as much of the United States as you do.

Mr. DOYLE. No; you don't, or you would apply for citizenship in it.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Well, I am entitled to say that I think——

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I should like to request that the chairman direct the witness to answer a group of questions here, and to answer specifically the question as to whether or not he has attempted to take out citizenship papers.

I ask him that question now again, and I should like to ask you directly to answer that single question.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; the Chair feels that is a simple question——

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. VELDE (continuing). That can be answered very simply, and it is entirely a legitimate question; and, so, the Chair directs the witness to answer this question.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Will you permit me, sir, to——

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Discuss this?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. The answer, Mr. Chairman, is "Yes."

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, when did you attempt to take out citizenship papers?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I have to decline to answer that, sir, on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then. I ask the witness be directed to answer the question: When did you attempt to take out citizenship papers?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. VELDE. If the witness answers he made such an attempt, I can see no way in which it can possibly incriminate him to tell when he made such an attempt, and the witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. BELFRAGE. I am told by my counsel, sir, I may answer that question.

This—the date was approximately July of 1937.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you took out or you attempted to take out the papers in July of 1937. You have already said you are not a citizen. So, I must assume you did not complete the steps.

Did you withdraw your application, or why was the application not followed through to completion?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that, sir, under the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to ask the witness: What type of visa are you now operating under, since your last entry into the country?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I am a resident alien.

Mr. KEARNEY. Resident alien?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Occupant status.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are there any proceedings before the Immigration Committee looking for your deportation?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like to repeat the question and ask that the witness be directed to answer.

You stated that you had attempted to take out citizenship papers. You gave us the time. Did you attempt to complete the becoming of a United States citizen?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. I ask that the witness be directed to answer that question.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; the witness is directed to answer the question.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer, sir, on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the United States Government in any way refuse to grant you citizenship?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I must decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. I ask the witness be directed to answer this question as to whether the United States Government refused to grant him citizenship.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. If the witness knows, he should answer, and is directed to answer that question.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Mr. Chairman, I must decline on the same ground.

Mr. VELDE. At this point, let the record show I have an executive session, in which I shall sit as a committee of one, and I will appoint Mr. Kearney as the acting chairman of this committee, with Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Doyle, and Mr. Frazier as the other members of a quorum of the full committee.

(Representative Harold H. Velde left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you ready, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. KEARNEY (presiding). Just to clear the record, I would like to go back to the question I asked the witness under what passport he was operating here at the present time. I would like to ask the witness: What type of visa did you obtain for your original entry into the country?

Mr. BELFRAGE. My original entry, sir, was just a temporary—a temporary visa—for visitors—a visitor's visa.

Mr. KEARNEY. A 6-months' visa?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. You had that renewed from time to time?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I had that renewed, and at other times I have come in on the special visa, which I am not sure what is called, for correspondents of publications, which entitle one to stay as long as one likes, as long as the employment continues.

Mr. CLARDY. But your last entry was under the standard—

Mr. BELFRAGE. My last entry—

Mr. CLARDY. Visitor's visa?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Was as an immigrant—British immigrant.

Mr. KEARNEY. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you married, Mr. Belfrage?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your wife's full name?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Mary Beatrice.

Mr. KUNZIG. This committee, I wish to state for the record, Mr. Chairman, is in the possession of sworn testimony in executive session to the effect that Mr. Belfrage, the witness here present today, has been a member of the Communist Party while being in the United States of America.

Mr. Belfrage, since you came to the United States of America, the first date of which I believe was in 1926, or thereabouts, have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would you so state if you were not a member of the Communist Party during that period of time?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever used an alias?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Isn't it a fact that you used the alias George Oakden in your writings and in your membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. The committee is in possession of sworn testimony, Mr. Chairman, to the effect that at the time of this testimony, covering the latter part of the 1930's, early 1940's, that the witness here lived on Oakden Drive, out near Hollywood, and the testimony was the party name of George Oakden was well remembered by the witness so testifying because Mr. Belfrage used the party name of George Oakden because he lived on Oakden Drive. As a matter of fact, the name he then used was used for writing in the New Masses and other left-wing magazines.

You have never heard of a George Oakden?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I would like to say most emphatically to that question that the fifth amendment is the shield of the innocent and under its guaranties I decline to answer any such questions.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I should like to read for the record a statement made by this witness in the book *Out of Bondage*, by Elizabeth Bentley, published by R. Hart-Davis, SoHo Square, London, if the committee will indulge. I shall read this and ask certain direct questions of Mr. Belfrage. I am now quoting:

Meanwhile, back in the summer of 1943, Yasha wanted to turn over to me a young Englishman who was then working for the British Intelligence Service. Cedric Belfrage had been a party sympathizer in Britain and after coming to this country got in touch with V. J. Jerome, who in turn put Belfrage in contact with Yasha.

For some time Cedric had been turning over to us extremely valuable information from the files of the British Intelligence Service, most of which I saw before it was relayed on to the Russians.

I remember one large volume of instructions to agents of British Intelligence which Yasha thought so good that we kept a copy of it in the safe at World Tourists, reading it occasionally for hints on undercover work. It was a most thorough manual: it gave minute directions on how to conduct a surveillance and how to avoid being tailed, and it even had a section on breaking and entering, which had been patriotically contributed by the burglars of Great Britain. As I looked through it, I realized why the British Intelligence Service had long



been known as a very excellent one. Obviously they knew their business from A to Z. One thing that stuck in my mind was their evaluation of motivations in choosing an agent. The best person, they said, was one who was motivated by patriotism or idealism, although if he became disillusioned he might be very hard to handle. Adventurers they brushed aside as being unreliable, while they considered bought agents as being very risky because someone else's intelligence service could always offer them more money.

Belfrage himself, Yasha told me, was an extremely odd character and rather difficult to deal with. Although passionately devoted to the cause—

and I might parenthetically state this is the cause of communism, as explained prior in the book—

he still considered himself to be a patriotic Britisher and, hence, he would give us no information that showed up England's mistakes or tended to make her a laughing stock. In addition, he was very nervous at what he was doing, and Yasha had all he could do to keep him in line.

The prospect of taking over one more highstrung agent did not appeal to me, nor did I desire to tangle with the British Intelligence Service. I stalled the proposition off for a few weeks. Then, fortunately, something happened that made any decision unnecessary.

In the early fall, Cedric brought Yasha some highly confidential information, cautioning him as usual to be very careful with it. Yasha, in line with his agreement, showed the material to Earl Browder, who incautiously gave it to *The Protestant*—

*The Protestant* is in italics—

one of the Communist-controlled publications. Immediately the data appeared in an article in such a form that the source could be readily identified by Cedric's superiors. It was a bad slip. Yasha, seething with rage, hotfooted it down to party headquarters to give Earl a talking to and then went off to see Belfrage. He returned to look at me hopelessly.

"Well, that's that," he said grimly. "We've just lost a good agent. Cedric is shivering with fright, and when I finished talking to him he bolted off in a panic, saying that he would never come back."

"But why did Earl do it?" I asked.

"Sheer stupidity," he said angrily. "He didn't think it would do any harm. Wouldn't you think that after all his years as a revolutionary he would know better?" Then, very grimly, "But I can assure you he won't do anything like that again, not after what I said to him."

There, I end the entire quote out of the book *Out of Bondage*, by Elizabeth Bentley. The words used, of course, were Elizabeth Bentley's words.

Now, Mr. Belfrage, are you the Cedric Belfrage mentioned in this book by Elizabeth Bentley, from which I have just read you a passage?

MR. BELFRAGE. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a very colorful passage, but I—

MR. KEARNEY. It might be a colorful passage, Mr. Belfrage, but can you answer the question?

MR. BELFRAGE. I don't know what to say. I'm flabbergasted by the question.

MR. KUNZIG. I don't see why he is flabbergasted. The book has been published a long time ago.

MR. BELFRAGE. Well, all I can say is, under the conditions existing here, where I have no due process of law, it would be grotesque for me to answer questions relating to some gossip in a book by somebody I don't know. It would be utterly grotesque, and I wouldn't—under the sixth amendment, I couldn't possibly consider answering.

MR. SCHERER. Did you say you didn't know Elizabeth Bentley?

MR. BELFRAGE. No.

Mr. SCHERER. Didn't you just say in your statement—

Mr. JONES. Yes; he did.

Mr. BELFRAGE. No, sir; I said I didn't know about this whole thing I am talking about.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you know Elizabeth Bentley?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I refuse to answer any questions under this—under these conditions.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you know the name Yasha?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I refuse to answer any questions on that, particularly under the sixth amendment, where I have no due processes of law, where I—

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE (continuing). And the fifth amendment; but I say I could not possibly answer any such questions on allegations such as that, where it is impossible to even confront the people involved—

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the British Intelligence Service?

Mr. BELFRAGE (continuing). And under the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer the question at all.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the British Intelligence Service?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, just—

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you mean to tell me if you stated you were a member of the British Intelligence Service it would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question on the grounds I cannot be asked to bear witness against myself.

Mr. KEARNEY. You would bear witness against yourself in answering whether or not you were in the service of your country?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I repeat my statement, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Proceed.

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion?

You have asked him a question that has to do with his employment by a foreign government. I submit that he should be directed to answer your question because whatever may have happened in Great Britain cannot possibly incriminate him under the laws of this Nation, and I think we are entitled to have him directed so that if the committee contemplates further action afterward there will be a clear record of a direction to the witness to answer a question that cannot incriminate him.

Mr. DAMBROFF. May I—

Mr. CLARDY. No; you may not. Counsel is not permitted to argue here.

Mr. DAMBROFF. May I ask the chairman of this committee to make reference to the statement of the preceding Congressman who just made a statement?

I would like to refer to it. I think it important to note that this statement in this book which was just read refers to activity within the United States.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I am not talking about that.

Mr. DAMBROFF. Well, that is the question.

Mr. CLARDY. I ask that he be directed to answer the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAMBROFF. That is the question that is being asked.

Mr. KEARNEY. The question that I asked was whether he was a member of the British Intelligence Service. That was the question, in substance, and he declined to answer on the grounds it might incriminate him; and I further followed up that by the question how could military service in one's country incriminate him.

Mr. DAMBROFF. And I——

Mr. CLARDY. Those were the questions I had in mind asking you to direct him to answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am going to direct the witness to answer the question——

Mr. BELFRAGE. Mr. Chairman, everyone——

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). As to——

Mr. BELFRAGE. Everyone——

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). As to whether he was a member of the British military service.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Mr. Chairman, everyone——

Mr. KUNZIG. Intelligence.

Mr. KEARNEY. British Intelligence Service.

Mr. BELFRAGE (continuing). Knows that many an innocent person has brought about his own indictment by waiving his constitutional privilege and unwittingly supplying some missing link in a chain of—in a chain of circumstantial evidence purporting to link him with a crime.

The pitfalls and dangers of testifying without immunity are such that experienced lawyers will not permit a client to so testify, however certain they may be of their innocence.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member——

Mr. BELFRAGE. Lawyers, of all, should——

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member——

Mr. BELFRAGE (continuing). Know that.

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). Of the British Intelligence Service in Great Britain?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Sir, I decline to answer on the ground that the fifth amendment is the protection of my shield of innocence, and I am protected by it.

Mr. KEARNEY. How can the fifth amendment—you are seeking refuge behind the fifth amendment—go to the fact that I ask you if you were a member of the British Intelligence Service in Great Britain?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Sir, I resent the suggestion I am sheltering behind the fifth amendment. I am not sheltering behind the fifth amendment. I am stating—I am asserting—my rights under the fifth amendment, which is quite a different thing.

Mr. DAMBROFF. I might—I might ask this committee to advise the witness how his activity in Great Britain——

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I think counsel——

Mr. DAMBROFF (continuing). Could possibly be within the context——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAMBROFF (continuing). Or purview of this committee.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEARNEY. Just a minute.

I think counsel will be afforded every opportunity on every question to consult with his client before the witness answers the question; but I direct the witness to answer the question as to whether or not he was a member of the British Intelligence in Great Britain.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I refuse to answer that, Mr. Congressman—

Mr. KEARNEY. On the procedure—

Mr. BELFRAGE (continuing). On the grounds—

Mr. SCHERER. Now, just a minute.

Mr. BELFRAGE. May I state my grounds? On the grounds it is not within the purview of this hearing and on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, just a minute. Mr. Chairman, I started to ask the witness before, and I was interrupted, about his testimony in response to Mr. Kunzig's question. It is my understanding in his statement the witness said, "You asked me about a woman, Elizabeth Bentley, whom I don't know."

I want, before we go any further with that, to ask this shorthand reporter to go back and read his testimony to see if my recollection is correct that he said he didn't know Elizabeth Bentley.

Mr. CLARDY. I heard him, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, now, will the committee please be in order. There is one member of the committee questioning him. Let him finish his question.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you mind taking the time to go back and read that part of the testimony. It was the witness' answer to Mr. Kunzig's question.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think if it is going to take up considerable time to look that answer up—why don't you ask the witness that question?

Mr. SCHERER. I want to be sure he said that.

(The reporter read the testimony back as follows:)

Now, Mr. Belfrage, are you the Cedric Belfrage mentioned in this book by Elizabeth Bentley, from which I have just read you a passage?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a very colorful passage, but I—

Mr. KEARNEY. It might be a colorful passage, Mr. Belfrage, but can you answer the question?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I don't know what to say. I'm flabbergasted by the question.

Mr. KUNZIG. I don't see why he is flabbergasted. The book has been published a long time ago.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Well, all I can say is, under the conditions existing here, where I have no due process of law, it would be grotesque for me to answer questions relating to some gossip in a book by somebody I don't know. It would be utterly grotesque, and I wouldn't—under the sixth amendment, I couldn't possibly consider answering.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you say you didn't know Elizabeth Bentley?

Mr. BELFRAGE. No.

Mr. SCHERER. Didn't you just say that in your statement—

Mr. JONES. Yes; he did.

Mr. BELFRAGE. No, sir; I said I didn't know about this whole thing I am talking about.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you know Elizabeth Bentley?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I refuse to answer any questions under this—under these conditions.

Mr. SCHERER. I submit the record is clear that he said he didn't know the author of the book, after you mentioned Elizabeth Bentley.

Now, do you say you don't know Elizabeth Bentley?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I didn't say that at all. I think you are making a great deal out of very little.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, somebody——

Mr. BELFRAGE. I didn't know. I was just speaking. I didn't say I knew anything about Elizabeth Bentley.

Mr. SCHERER. Written by somebody you don't know—that was your statement.

Mr. BELFRAGE. No; I didn't mean it that way at all, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. You didn't mean it that way——

Mr. BELFRAGE. You can——

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). But that is your statement.

Mr. BELFRAGE. You can read it that way if you want to, but that is the——

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, it is very simple to ask another simple question: Do you know Elizabeth Bentley, the author of that book?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question, sir——

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, we have wasted a lot of time to get that answer, haven't we?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like to get an answer to my question. I haven't yet gotten a direct answer. I asked you whether you were the Cedric Belfrage referred to on page 167 of Elizabeth Bentley's book, *Out of Bondage*?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever turn over extremely valuable information from the files of the British Intelligence Service while you were here in the United States of America, and to Russian agents?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. You said, "Russian agents." You are talking about the one Jacob Golos, called Yasha in the book, are you not?

Mr. KUNZIG. I was just coming to that name you are mentioning, sir.

Do you know a Jacob Golos—G-o-l-o-s?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever know a Jacob Golos?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer—the same answer——

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE (continuing). The same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you work with a Soviet spy ring with which Jacob Golos was connected?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer—same ground.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, let's go back a little bit, because we got away from it. Would you tell the committee about your service in either the British or American forces during the war?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer—the same ground.

Mr. KUNZIG. You decline to tell this committee whether you served even the country of Great Britain or the United States of America during the war on the grounds it might incriminate you?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Correct, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. I think he should be directed to answer that, Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. I so request also, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. The witness will answer the question.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I am compelled to decline, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEARNEY. Proceed.

Mr. SCHIERER. Was there anything in connection with that service which would incriminate you?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I am compelled to decline that question, too, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. May I make a statement to him?

You continually say you are compelled to decline to answer. By that, do you mean you are declining to answer?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I mean that I—

Mr. CLARDY. There is no compulsion to compel you, or anything else.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I do so.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you mean you are declining?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I am declining to answer, with reluctance.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you so state it after this so there will be no confusion?

Mr. KEARNEY. In the future, in order to have no confusion, would you please just say you decline to answer?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline certainly.

Mr. CLARDY. You may not have the protection you seek unless you do.

Mr. KEARNEY. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you with the Psychological Warfare Division of SHAEF?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. I direct the witness to answer that question.

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you placed in charge of German newspapers of West Germany in order to see that they were democratic?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you hire known Communists to work for the German newspapers in Frankfurt?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were some of those people whom you hired later thrown out as Communists?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. What terminated your employment or tour of duty when you were with the armed services in Germany?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who appointed you or placed you in this position in Frankfurt, Germany, over the newspapers?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I think that is one on which he should be directed to answer. The question was: Who placed him in charge?

Mr. KEARNEY. Read that question, will you, please?

(The reporter read the questions as follows:)

Who appointed you or placed you in this position in Frankfurt, Germany, over the newspapers?

Mr. KEARNEY. I direct the witness to answer that question.

Mr. BELFRAGE. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman; I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know an Ameil—A-m-e-i-l—Carlebach—C-a-r-l-e-b-a-c-h—who was one of the people connected with the German newspaper Frankfurter Rundschau—R-u-n-d-s-c-h-a-u?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Didn't you have this man Ameil Carlebach, who has been described as a brilliant and admitted Communist Party member, put into work with this paper?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Didn't you defend the appointment of this person Carlebach in an article entitled "The German Who Should Have Been Dead," which appeared in the June 1948 issue of Harper's magazine?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. You decline to answer as to whether or not you wrote an article for Harper's magazine?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Correct, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. I request the witness be directed to answer the question as to whether he wrote an article entitled "The German Who Should Have Been Dead," which appeared in the June 1948 issue of Harper's magazine.

Mr. KEARNEY. The Chair directs the witness to answer the question.

Mr. BELFRAGE. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman; I decline on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Perhaps it should be explained to him, Mr. Chairman, when he invokes the fifth amendment without cause he, of course, lays himself open to further action—

Mr. KEARNEY. I think—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). By this committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think the witness has been fully advised as to his rights.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, as has already been said before this committee many times, I wish to state again for the record that various front organizations, known as Communist-front organizations, leftist-front organizations, have existed from time to time in the United States of America, and I should now like the permission of the chairman to request and ask questions of this witness with regard to var-

ious associations that he has formed and various groups to which he has lent his name since he came to this country.

Mr. KEARNEY. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you write an article for the New Masses entitled "Politics Catches Up With the Writer" in the December 28, 1947, issue?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. The New Masses, of course, was cited as a Communist periodical by Attorney General Francis Biddle, September 24, 1942.

If the committee will bear with me, we will take these one by one.

Did you lend your name to the League of American Writers in which the Hollywood chapter of the League of American Writers drafted and got signatures to be sent to Leon Blum at the French Embassy asking that the French border be opened in the Spanish war at the time of the Spanish war?

The League of American Writers has been designated and cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark and by a group of other committees, and so forth, that have named the group.

Did you lend your name—

Mr. DOYLE. What year was that cited?

Mr. KUNZIG. This was cited September 21, 1948.

It was cited in 1942 by Attorney General Francis Biddle.

In 1941 the State Department quoted a letter from Harold Ickes:

The League of American Writers is generally regarded as a Communist subsidiary. Its policies, of course, always parallel those of the Communist Party.

This committee cited it as such in 1940.

In 1938 it was cited by the Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In 1942 it was cited by the Rapp-Coudert report.

This, of course, was done a few years prior to that time, but the citations, as I might point out for the record, were based, of course, on the activities of this group at that time, at the time Mr. Belfrage or a Cedric Belfrage lent his name.

Did you so lend your name?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you sign an appeal for lifting the arms embargo on the Spanish Government which appeared in the Daily Worker April 8, 1938, signed Cedric Belfrage?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member of the board of the National Committee for People's Rights, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City, on November 15, 1938?

The National Committee for People's Rights was cited in 1942 by Attorney General Biddle; in 1942 by a Special Committee on Un-American Activities; in 1947 by this committee, and in 1948 by the California committee.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.



Mr. KUNZIG. Were you on the executive committee of Commonwealth College in Mena—Me-n-a—Arkansas, in 1940?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Commonwealth College was cited as Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1949, by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944, and by the Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1938.

Were you in June of 1939 a member of the advisory committee of the same Commonwealth College, the Southern Resident Labor School, in Mena, Ark., in 1939?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, I think it would be well for you to indicate at this time that the information upon which your questions are based is coming from photostatic copies of the documents themselves which you are referring to.

Mr. KUNZIG. Thank you very much, Mr. Clardy.

I think the record should show each question is being based upon a photostatic copy of a document from the organization or the newspaper which is being mentioned at the time.

Mr. CLARDY. And which shows the facts upon which your question is based: is that right?

Mr. KUNZIG. Each fact is shown. All the questions and facts are listed here, and I am reading directly from the publications.

Did you lend your name to the United American Spanish-Aid Committee, as appears in a list of a nationwide campaign listed in the Daily Worker, New York, Tuesday, July 23, 1940?

A Cedric Belfrage is listed there.

The United American Spanish Aid Committee was cited as Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1949; the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944; the California Committee in 1948.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Let me ask the witness, Mr. Counsel: Would the witness care to scan some of these photostatic copies that counsel has?

Mr. KUNZIG. I will be glad to turn it all over to him, sir.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I don't think that's necessary.

Mr. KEARNEY. No point in it?

Mr. BELFRAGE. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you write a book on the life of Claude Williams for the People's Institute of Applied Religion, which was cited as subversive and Communist in 1949 by Attorney General Tom Clark?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. This is a further reference to the People's Institute of Applied Religion: Were you on the international board and among the sponsors—Cedric Belfrage, author—of this People's Institute of Applied Religion in 1948, January the 1st?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you appear in Brooklyn at a Brownsville YPA rally to protest the rights on civil rights with E. Gurley Flynn? Did you make a speech together with E. Gurley Flynn in December of 1948 as listed in the Daily Worker?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, in the National Guardian, the paper which has as its editor a Cedric Belfrage, did you write an article on April 4, 1949, concerning the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, backing and supporting that organization, which organization—National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions—has been cited as a Communist front by this committee in 1949?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. May I see that?

Mr. KUNZIG. As reported in the Daily Worker of February 22, 1950, did you speak at a dinner-symposium sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, which has been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947, by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944, and by the California Committee in 1948?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. I should like to read for the record a short article—very brief; a few paragraphs—from the New Leader of September 9, 1950. It says:

Editor of "progressive" paper buddy-buddy with German red.

We received a letter from Heinz Putzrath—P-u-t-z-r-a-t-h—of the Social Democratic Party of Germany containing information on some Communists and associates that should be of interest to the Americans. The letter reads:

"From a report about Wilhelm Karl Gerst, the chief of the Communist news services in Western Germany, we have seen that Gerst has close contact with the editor of the New York National Guardian, Mr. Cedric Belfrage. Belfrage was American control officer of the Frankfurter Rundschau—R-u-n-d-s-c-h-a-u—at the time when Gerst was coeditor and licensee of this paper.

"There is no doubt that Gerst is an important personage in the Communist apparatus in Germany, and we think it might interest you to get this information.

(Signed) HEINZ PUTZRATH

and

AUGUST CLAESSENS.

*Executive Secretary, the Social Democratic Federation."*

Do you know or did you ever know a Wilhelm Karl Gerst?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was Gerst a coeditor and licensee of the Frankfurter Rundschau?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Isn't it a fact you knew Gerst as a Communist when you were over in Germany connected with the German newspapers?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you appear along with other names as a signer of the World Peace Appeal, which has been cited by the congressional

Committee on Un-American Activities in 1951 as Communist inspired?

Mr. KEARNEY. What date is that?

Mr. KUNZIG. September 11, 1950, it was received by the committee. There doesn't appear to be a date printed, sir.

You decline to answer?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you give a speech before the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, 114 East 32d Street, at the educational conference of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Saturday, March 3, 1951, at the Brevoort Hotel, New York City, under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship?

I have already, I believe, mentioned the council has been cited as subversive and Communist.

Did you give such a speech?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you the author of a book called *A Faith to Free the People in 1944 and Abide With Me in 1948*?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, to satisfy my own personal curiosity, why would the admission of such a book tend to incriminate you?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. While you are asking that question, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if he will admit to being the author of the article in *Black and White* way back in December 1939 entitled "Nude Without Being Rude."

Did you write that article?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

I don't remember the article. So, I have to say that, without knowing it.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, let's see if you recognize it if we show it to you.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. CLARDY. It is the first entry at the top under Table of Contents.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Oh, I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean such an article would tend to incriminate you if you admitted authorship, Mr. Witness?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer, sir, on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here an issue of the *Daily Worker* of Wednesday, April 11, 1951; also Monday, April 16, 1951; and the *Daily People's World*, April 19, 1951—all of which, in one form or another, mention Cedric Belfrage, a Cedric Belfrage, as one of the group of notables to welcome three of the jailed Hollywood 10—Dalton Trumbo, John Howard Lawson, and so forth. Did you greet those

and act as a member of a greeting committee of those jailed Hollywood 10 in 1951?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Counsel, I don't want to be facetious or attempt to inject an alleged humor into this hearing, but all I can see up here on this Black and White is "Belfrage Exposes Nudist Camps." That is the title of the article, is it, by—

Mr. BELFRAGE. That's what is there; yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, again, I am curious as to why an article with such a title would tend to incriminate you.

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer the question, Mr. Chairman, on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the statute of limitations would run against any crime, if there was one, dealing with nudism as mentioned in that article, because it was back in the thirties.

Mr. KEARNEY. Proceed.

Mr. DOYLE. That was in December 1939 that he wrote that.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Belfrage, did you appear on Sunday, February the 3d, at Hotel Brevoort, Fifth Avenue and Eighth Street, in New York City, as a speaker at the ninth anniversary of the Stalingrad victory in a meeting entitled "Remember Stalingrad," sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, the citations of which as un-American and Communist inspired, and so forth, I have already mentioned?

Did you appear as a speaker under that sponsorship—

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer—

Mr. KUNZIG. At that time?

Mr. BELFRAGE. On the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. The Daily Worker, Monday, March the 10th, 1952, has an article entitled "Notables Protest Curbs on Lawyers in Political Trials."

It was a defense of Harry Sachse, one of the attorneys in the so-called Medina trial, the trial of the 11 Communists.

Did you participate at the Carnegie Hall rally in defense of Harry Sachse and the other attorneys involved there, as is listed here in the Daily Worker, Monday, March the 10th—

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer—

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). 1952?

Mr. BELFRAGE (continuing). On the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you speak on April the 23d, 1952, under the sponsorship again of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, at a symposium on "The Future of Germany and World Peace," as listed here in the Daily Worker, Monday, April the 14th, 1952?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you speak as a featured speaker under the sponsorship of the National Lawyers' Guild in Los Angeles on or about July 9, 1952, as listed in the Daily People's World of July 2, 1952?

The National Lawyers' Guild, of course, has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944, by the Un-American Activities Committee, this committee, in 1950, by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947,

and was mentioned by the New York City Council Committee Investigating the Municipal Civil Service Commission.

Did you so speak?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you speak at a meeting sponsored by the Independent Progressive Party, which has been cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1948 as a Communist front, your speech having been listed in the Daily People's World of Thursday, July 10, 1952?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you speak as editor of the National Guardian on July 27, 1952, at the California Labor School?

The California Labor School has been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1948, and by the Committee on Un-American Activities, this committee, in 1947.

Did you so speak?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. I might mention that the article, if I might read a bit from the article, in the Daily People's World, Friday, July 25, 1952, says:

Belfrage has been editor of the Guardian since its inception 4 years ago. The news weekly has given full support to the Progressive Party and its nominee, San Francisco Attorney Vincent Hallinan for President, and Mrs. Charlotta Bass, former publisher of the California Eagle, for Vice President.

As a member of SHAEF, the Allies' psychological warfare team, Belfrage helped to establish the first post-Nazi newspapers in Aachen—A-a-c-h-e-n, Frankfurt, and other German cities.

Are you the same Cedric Belfrage as is mentioned in the Daily People's World that I have just read to you, Friday, July 25, 1952?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you speak at a reception for the DuBois-Jerome-Marzani Sunday, the Sunday immediately following November 13, 1952, this reception being sponsored by the New York Council, ASP?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you sign, along with other writers, artists, a clemency petition as listed in the Daily Worker, Wednesday, January 21, 1953, for the Rosenbergs?<sup>1</sup>

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you finished, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. I am finished with this.

May I continue, sir?

I am finished with this list of front organizations.

During your residence in the United States, since the first time you came here, did you receive for transmission to the Soviet Union any confidential information of any type whatsoever?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

<sup>1</sup> Julius and Ethel Rosenberg.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you transmit any such confidential material?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the same ground.

Mr. KEARNEY. Have you finished with the witness?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEARNEY. Before I ask the members of the committee if they have any questions of Mr. Belfrage, I just would like to state my own personal opinion.

I will say this: That as a witness you have been consistent in your answers.

As a foreigner you, along with many others, have come to our country and taken advantage of our hospitality and tried to do those things obnoxious to the vast majority of the American people and do away with our way of life.

One thing I cannot understand—unless, of course, that naturally should be or would be hidden—is your reticence to talk about your military service, because I believe that is the proudest thing that a man citizen of any country can hand down—the fact that he has served in the armed forces of his own country—and I can't understand your attitude.

I do not know what the situation is with reference to any deportation proceedings that might be against you at the present time, but I want to say what I am going to do, as an individual. I am going to contact the immigration authorities and find out why you are in this country.

I think that you are the type that should be deported, and deported immediately. You should be deported for the common good of our country.

Any questions?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; I have a few.

Witness, Counsel, in one series of his questions dealing with articles in the National Guardian, mentioned an article in the Guardian as of April 4, 1949, which is listed as by Cedric Belfrage, and in that article I find that throughout it is discussing the conference held at the Waldorf-Astoria in March of 1949—the 25th, 26th, and 27th, to be exact.<sup>1</sup>

First, were you present at all yesterday during the taking of testimony?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Part of the day.

Mr. CLARDY. Were you present when one of the witnesses discussed and was examined on the subject of that particular peace conference held at the Waldorf-Astoria?

Mr. BELFRAGE. No, Mr. Congressman, I was not here.

Mr. CLARDY. You didn't hear that?

Mr. BELFRAGE. No; I came in the afternoon.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, then, it will take a little prefacing in order to explain this. It will be very brief.

That conference was called by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which group was a successor to the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

I am telling you this even though I feel very sure you know it, but I want to bring it to your attention because I am working up to a question.

---

<sup>1</sup> Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace.

At that conference a great many speakers discussed Soviet Russia and discussed other subjects dealing with it, and I want to read to you something that has been written about it. It expresses what I have in mind as background very clearly.

It says, speaking of the time of the conference:

There was no longer any reason for intelligent people to doubt that the Soviet Union, its American agents, and their Communist-front apparatus were enemies of the United States. Cold War I was full upon us.

It says that because of the fact that it had been about a year prior to that that the cold war had broken out in the Berlin airlift, and then it says this:

In attendance at the Waldorf-Astoria were many well-known European Communists. Even the State Department publicly recognized the Communist character of the gathering by issuing a statement denouncing it and by refusing to grant visas to some of the European Communist applicants who wished to attend.

Now, although that was published at the time and those of us who keep up with these things were familiar with it at that time, it is brought together in an article by J. B. Matthews in the current issue, the May issue, of the American Mercury.

Now, I turn back to the April 4, 1949, article written by you in the National Guardian about that same conference, and I want to ask you some questions on what I am going to now read, and I ask you to attend well upon what I do read:

It was a brilliant success—

speaking of the conference—

against the combined efforts of every great power in the land, starting with the State Department, the Catholic hierarchy, the Governor of the State, the mayor of the city, and almost the entire press, to bring it down in an avalanche of hysteria.

Do you have any recognition or any recollection of having written those words which were published in this National Guardian?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Mr. Congressman, I decline to answer that question on the grounds—

Mr. CLARDY. Do you now agree with the sentiments expressed in the language I have just read to you?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I must again decline to answer upon the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. And I read one other quote from the article obviously written by you:

Everyone knew there were many Communists present—

meaning present at the conference we are talking about—

they were listened to with great respect, as everyone else.

Do you recall writing that language, acknowledging that there were a great many Communists present at that particular conference?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I again decline, sir, on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you know whether or not that was the fact or not, independently of what you may have written at that time?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that question—same ground.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Mr. Belfrage, a few more questions and then I am done.

Let's move back to your time when you were in Great Britain, for just a brief moment—and my questions now are confined entirely to the period of time before you first came to our shores.

At any time before you came to America were you a member of the Communist Party, either of Great Britain or of the international organization?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

MR. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that, sir.

MR. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask he be directed to answer because that obviously cannot incriminate him under the laws of this land.

MR. KEARNEY. No; I am going to let the witness stand on his answer to that question.

MR. CLARDY. Well, I think perhaps—

MR. KEARNEY. It is consistent with his whole testimony.

MR. CLARDY. I think the chairman will agree he probably should be, but I shall not press it.

MR. KEARNEY. Well, let it stand as it is.

MR. CLARDY. It may serve a more useful purpose at that.

Were you at any time prior to coming to this land engaged in any subversive activity whatsoever against your own land?

MR. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

MR. CLARDY. Are you now presently engaged in any conspiracy against this, your adopted land, or land which you apparently at one time sought to adopt?

MR. BELFRAGE. I again decline to answer the question on the ground of the fifth amendment.

MR. CLARDY. Are you presently making any active effort to become a citizen of this land?

MR. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that, sir, on the ground of the fifth amendment.

MR. CLARDY. Do you have any desire or intention of becoming a citizen of this land?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

MR. KEARNEY. Well, I think as far as the hearing is concerned—I will say to my colleague I think that is beside the point.

MR. CLARDY. It probably is, but I would like to know whether or not he at this juncture may have changed his mind.

MR. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, if I may, there are one or two minor questions—

MR. CLARDY. He hasn't answered.

I would like to have him decline to answer, if he will.

Do you decline, Witness, to answer that question?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

MR. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, two brief questions, if I may.

MR. KEARNEY. The Congressman hasn't finished.

MR. KUNZIG. I am sorry.

MR. CLARDY. Just wait until he finishes.

MR. KUNZIG. I am sorry, sir.

MR. CLARDY. I have finished, but he hasn't.

MR. BELFRAGE. Perhaps if you can arrange it, I will consider the question.

MR. CLARDY. Arrange what?



Mr. BELFRAGE. To become one.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean if I should intercede on your behalf?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. That is absolutely the last think I would attempt to do.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean there are some obstacles in the way of your becoming a citizen?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that.

Mr. KEARNEY. I thought you would.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Belfrage, did you lecture before an organization known as the American Women for Peace, which has been cited as a Communist-front organization by this committee in April 1951?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know a Rev. John Darr—D-a-r-r?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer that on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Isn't it a fact he addressed the Communist-sponsored world peace conference in Berlin in early March 1951, and you are an associate of his?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is it true, Mr. Belfrage, you were 1 of 2 Americans who received invitations to attend the party convention of the Communist Party, the East German Christian Democratic Party, held in Berlin on September 14 and 15, 1950?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Isn't it a fact you were 1 of the 2 invited, but you were unable to attend because of your inability to get a visa?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. No further questions, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I don't have any question, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to make just one observation: I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States for only 4 months, but I can't understand how the witness here today could be the head of a psychological warfare branch of SHAEF in Germany as late as 1948 to 1950. I just can't understand that, and then some people say this committee isn't necessary.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think the answer to that will have to be given by some other agency.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, I understand, but I am going to try to find out how that happened, and I am going to try to find out who was responsible for his being in that position as late as 1948 to 1950.

Mr. CLARDY. You will have some help in that endeavor.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I made a note, sir, as you testified—"I am not at present American citizen; first came here in April 1926," and then you said, "I traveled back and forth a great deal."

Do you remember so saying?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I think I did say that; yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I am sure you did.

Now, traveled back and forth—where to? The United States a great deal?

Mr. BELFRAGE. England.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, when you went to England, did you also go to other countries?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I once went to Germany.

Mr. DOYLE. You once went to Germany?

Mr. BELFRAGE. During that period, I think.

Mr. DOYLE. Any other country when you traveled back and forth from the United States a great deal since 1926?

Mr. BELFRAGE. No; I didn't go anywhere else during that period.

If I understand the period you are speaking about correctly, I don't think—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I am speaking of any period, or the total period, since April 1926—

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Which is the date you gave in answer to a question back to me, which is the first date you came to the United States.

Mr. BELFRAGE. At any time since I have been in the United States, you wish to know?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, please.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes; I have to again refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I will specifically ask you then whether or not since April 1926 you left the United States and went to Russia—and if so, how many times.

Mr. BELFRAGE. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. I didn't hear your answer.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. And when you filed your application, if you did, with our appropriate governmental agency, to go to Russia or to go to England, did you specify on that application all of the countries to which you intended to travel, or did you leave out some names?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, if you didn't leave out any of those names of those individual countries, you would be willing to say so, wouldn't you?

Mr. BELFRAGE. No; I would decline to answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. You would decline to answer?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. You, yourself, volunteered, I think, in your testimony that you considered this committee and its interrogations getting into the area of abridging the freedom of the press.

As I recall it, back in 1791 one of the basic objections to our proposed Constitution of the United States of America was the fact there was no Bill of Rights and, by general agreement, and otherwise, it was put off until, I think, 1791, and then 10 of the 12 amendments submitted were ratified, and 1 of those was the first amendment, which

does specify that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

Now, certainly this committee has no desire, directly or indirectly, to abridge any freedom of speech, nor of the press, and with that preface by me I want to ask you 2 or 3 questions about this National Guardian of which, in spite of your answer, it appears that you at least are the editor, or chief writer.

Is this National Guardian, to which you refer or which we referred, a newspaper published in New York? Is it still published? Is it a newspaper?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I—it is; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. And is it published daily?

Mr. BELFRAGE. It's published weekly, I understand.

Mr. DOYLE. And are you the editor?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. And where is it published in New York, weekly?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I think the address is on it, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, will you find it, please, and read me it?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). I refer to you what appears to be a photostat.

Mr. BELFRAGE. That is a photostat.

Mr. CLARDY. He just wants to know where you report for work each day.

Mr. DOYLE. No; I wasn't even going to ask him that.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). But where is this published, if it is a newspaper—

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). And you testified to that?

Mr. BELFRAGE. It is published in New York City.

Mr. DOYLE. Where, sir?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I understand that the address is 17 Murray Street, near—near city hall.

Mr. DOYLE. And is it a subscription paper, or paid subscriptions to it, or what?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I know people who subscribed to it.

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. DOYLE. You know people who subscribed to it. Does it carry advertising?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I refuse to answer, sir, on the ground of the—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I am just—

Mr. BELFRAGE (continuing). Fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Taking you at your own word, and bona fide, I am asking you—and I think it proper, in view of your volunteering that you would consider looking toward the abridgement of the freedom of the press—I am trying to find what the facts are—as to whether or not this National Guardian is actually a member of the press.

Mr. BELFRAGE. What is the question, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Does it carry advertising—

Mr. BELFRAGE. I refuse—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Paid advertising?

Mr. BELFRAGE. To answer that.

I suggest, Mr. Doyle, you should read it. It is on public sale, and you could find out.

Mr. DOYLE. On public sale in New York?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I will accept your suggestion, sir, and I think I will buy one to see if I can find another article by you in it tonight or tomorrow, or the next few days.

Mr. CLARDY. Better find out where it is on sale, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. How large a circulation does it have?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. I refuse to answer that question, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I am sorry.

Mr. BELFRAGE. I refuse to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. On the ground of the fifth amendment?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Correct.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't include the first amendment now in your answer?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Sir, it's automatic as far as I'm concerned; but I understand the courts of this land are not always willing to uphold it. So, I have to use the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. What do you mean?

I didn't understand your meaning there.

You mean your answers are automatic?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I say that I will always defend the first amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask a question on that?

Mr. BELFRAGE. And the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Just a minute.

Mr. CLARDY. Oh, I thought he was through.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that is all.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. Just one question: How many trips did you make back and forth to Great Britain after your first admission in 1926?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I'm afraid I can't remember exactly, sir.

Mr. FRAZIER. Well, approximately.

Mr. BELFRAGE. Oh, I should think about 8 or 9.

Mr. FRAZIER. Did you defray the expense of those trips yourself, or did somebody else pay for your passage back and forth?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Not to my recollection.

Mr. FRAZIER. What?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. BELFRAGE. Yes; I did.

Mr. FRAZIER. You did?

Mr. BELFRAGE. I paid for them myself, including all of my—all of my trips over.

Mr. FRAZIER. All right.

That is all.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you have any further questions?

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, has any action of this committee at any time interfered with the issuance of any issue of that National Guardian?

(At this point Mr. Belfrage conferred with Mr. Dambroff.)

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). In other words, has any action of this committee caused it to skip publication date at some time?

Mr. BELFRAGE. Not that I know of, sir, but I think that bringing me here is calculated to do that.

Mr. KEARNEY. We are not interested, Mr. Witness, in what you think about bringing you here.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask, to make sure it is on the record, in case it may be omitted; what is your present residence address?

Mr. BELFRAGE. 310 West 99th, New York City.

Mr. KUNZIG. Thank you.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is there any reason why this witness should not be excused?

Mr. KUNZIG. No reason, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. The witness is excused.

The committee will take a 10-minute recess.

(Whereupon, at 3 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 3:10 p. m., the same day.)

(The hearing reconvened at 3:20 p. m., the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Bernard W. Kearney, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, and Clyde Doyle.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Reporter, let the record show at this point that present are Mr. Kearney, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Doyle, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, a quorum of the full committee.

Do you have a witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Arnaud D'Usseau.

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand?

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I do.

Mr. VELDE. Be seated, please.

Mr. D'USSEAU. The lights don't bother me at the moment. If they do, may I request that they—

Mr. VELDE. Certainly.

Mr. D'USSEAU (continuing). Be discontinued?

#### TESTIMONY OF ARNAUD D'USSEAU, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ROYAL W. FRANSE

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. D'USSEAU. Arnaud D'Usseau.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your name, please?

Mr. D'USSEAU. A-r-n-a-u-d D-'-U-s-s-e-a-u.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Counsel, will you please identify yourself for the record?

Mr. FRANSE. Royal W. Franse, 104 East 40th Street, New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. D'Usseau?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I was born in Los Angeles on April 18, 1916.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. D'USSEAU. New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I am a playwright.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, briefly what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I attended several parochial schools. One of them, if I recall correctly, was St. Malachy's Parochial School; another one a little later on was called St. John's Military Academy—also a Catholic school. I attended the Machenzie School, which I don't think any longer exists but at that time was a boarding school. I have attended the public schools of Los Angeles; the Le Conte Junior High School, Hollywood High School, and later on Beverly Hills High School, from which I was graduated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how long you have been engaged as a playwright?

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, actually, I've been writing plays ever since I got out of high school.

Would you like to know something about my career as a playwright?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. That is what I would like to know.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, I am coauthor of the play *Deep Are the Roots*, which opened on Broadway, I believe, in 1945; got very good notices generally from the press. It ran for 14 months on Broadway.

I almost said 14 years. That would have been nice.

For 14 months.

It played on the road for almost that length of time. It has been performed in, I would say, virtually every country in the world—in England, in Poland, in Israel, in Yugoslavia, in Italy, the Soviet Union, in India, in Australia—as I say, in almost every country of the world.

It is a play——

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now——

Mr. D'USSEAU. About——

Mr. TAVENNER. It will not be necessary to describe the details of the play.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, I would like to, if you don't mind, simply because I believe it is very important to give a picture of the sort of work I do.

It is a play about racial discrimination in the South. It is the story of a returning Negro war veteran. The point of the play was to try and show a race prejudice does great moral injury to both the white person and the Negro.

My collaborator and I were very—very disturbed by this subject, and undertook to write the play. It took us 18 months to write it; and, as I say, it was very well received.

At the time it was reviewed I got a visit from the FBI. I don't know whether he was an official agent of the FBI. However, he

asked for a manuscript. I said I didn't think the manuscript was necessary—or, rather, I and the people involved in the production didn't think the manuscript was necessary as the play was running. He then asked for reviews of the play. When he was told that it got a very fine review in both the New York Times and the New York Herald-Tribune, we never heard from him again.

I'm also the author of a play—a coauthor of the play—Tomorrow the World. This play was equally successful. It ran for over a year on Broadway, toured the country for over a year, has played in a great many countries throughout the world. It was also made into a motion picture.

This is a play about the conflict between the American way of life and the Nazi way of life. It's a play about a small Nazi boy who comes to this country and finds himself in conflict with the democratic point of view. The point of the play was to try and alert Americans to the idea of—or the dangers, I should say, of in any way being tolerant toward those who preached anti-Semitism, violence, tyranny—all the things we know that Hitler stood for.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Witness, I think your explanation of your play is very good, and probably is interesting, but it isn't entirely in line with the work of this committee; and I don't believe that any inference should be drawn relative to your statement about the FBI's request of a script.

I would appreciate it if you would conclude your statement relative to your career so we can get on with the rest of the questions——

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). We have to ask you.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I will be glad to.

I will only say this, if I may: That these plays have engaged my efforts over periods of years. It took me 18 months to write one. It took me over 6 to write another.

I have a number of other plays I would like to talk about because I think it's important to show that I have, in no way, ever attempted to hide my feelings on what very often are considered controversial and unpopular ideas.

Now, if you don't want to hear any more about my plays, I won't go on.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think it would be sufficient if you would give us the names of the plays, or some of them—not necessarily all.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, there was another play which ran on Broadway—was not as successful—called Legend of Sarah and it has had very successful amateur and stock production.

I would like to add one point about that which I think is relevant, and that is: It was played in Pasadena——

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, we are not interested——

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, this is important.

Mr. TAVENNER. We are not interested where it played or whether it was successful or unsuccessful.

Mr. D'USSEAU. But this has something to do with the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will just give the committee a brief statement of what your works have been, it will be sufficient for our purposes.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Wouldn't you like to know that this play was protested by the American Legion at the Pasadena Playhouse and that my name was taken off——

Mr. TAVENNER. No; we are not investigating that at all.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I see.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just tell us what your works have been.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, I have written a number of plays—some of them unproduced. In the Drunk——

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you this.

Mr. D'USSEAU. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you also write for the screen?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I did. I wrote for——

Mr. TAVENNER. What are——

Mr. D'USSEAU. I went to the Army.

Let me give you my screen record.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I entered in the Army. This is what I did for the Army. I wrote general material for the Army 21½ years.

I took basic training and went to Signal Corps in Astoria, and I wrote films for the Army.

Again, I would like to go into these films. I think it is important.

One committee member has expressed an interest in a man's military record.

I would like to make a point——

Mr. TAVENNER. We would be——

Mr. D'USSEAU (continuing). About that.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Very glad to have the names of them.

Mr. D'USSEAU. All right.

There was one on the soldier vote. At that time, if you will recall, there was a great deal of controversy whether or not the soldier should be permitted to vote. There was great feeling in this country that he should not. It was debated on the floor of Congress.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. D'USSEAU (continuing). It was the feeling, however, of the military and of the commander in chief at that time that the soldier should be permitted to vote.

Mr. KEARNEY. May I interrupt there?

Mr. D'USSEAU. And I wrote a film on the subject.

Mr. KEARNEY. May I interrupt there?

Mr. D'USSEAU. Sure.

Mr. KEARNEY. It was also the feeling of the majority of the Members of Congress they should be entitled to vote.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Indeed, that is so.

Mr. CLARDY. May I add one thing more?

It wasn't a question of whether they were entitled to vote, but the mechanics of how it should be handled in several of the States.

Mr. D'USSEAU. That was part of the problem, Congressman.

Mr. CLARDY. That was the problem—and I am speaking as a lawyer with considerable experience in this field.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I am also speaking with considerable experience and, if my memory is correct, there was a great deal of controversy, even while——



Mr. CLARDY. There was no controversy over whether the soldiers could or should vote. It was a question of how it could be accomplished without disrupting things.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, I recall when I wrote the film one of the points made was the soldier was urged to vote. Despite any outside influences or anybody who told him anyway differently, it was his privilege to vote.

Mr. CLARDY. He should have.

Mr. D'USSEAU. That's right.

Another film I wrote—and this is the only other one I will mention—was the film on the Japanese-American troops. Now, again, you will recall there was much feeling about this during the war. A number of Japanese-Americans had been deported—had been taken from their homes in California and sent to camps.

Mr. VELDE. What was the name of the play?

Mr. D'USSEAU. It was a film on Japanese-Americans, their activities in France—in Italy, and later in France.

Mr. VELDE. What was the name of it?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I think it was just called The Japanese-American Soldier. I have forgotten the precise—

Mr. KEARNEY. Did that involve itself around the 442d Combat Regiment?

Mr. D'USSEAU. Thank you, Congressman. It did. The point I tried to make was: No matter what the pigmentation of a man's skin was, no matter what his national origin was, if he believed in democracy it was making him an effective soldier—and this is borne out by the record.

The record will bear you out there, Congressman.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think that was the most decorated regiment of the American Army.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I believe so, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are the principal screen credits which you received as a writer for the screen?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I worked on a number of films. I can't remember them all.

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't ask you for—

Mr. D'USSEAU. I don't—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). All of them; just a few of them.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I think one was called One Crowded Night.

I worked on one—I didn't get any screen credit on it—called Suspicion.

I worked on a number of B pictures—mystery stories—that were called Michael Shayne Series.

I worked on a film for Gary Cooper. I've forgotten what the title was.

They were assignments—I took them because I had to eat. I've forgotten what most of them were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period of time did you live in Hollywood or Los Angeles?

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, as I think I suggested, from my educational background, Los Angeles is my home. I mean, I've worked in El Sereno for the United Press for a while, brief while.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, will you give—

Mr. D'USSEAU. California is my home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. D'USSEAU. It was my home up until I came to New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you resided in New York?

Mr. D'USSEAU. Ever since I got out of the Army.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would be 1945 or 1946?

Mr. D'USSEAU. The end of—about 6 or 7 months after the end of the war. I have taken trips back to see my family, but for the most part I have lived here.

Mr. TAVENNER. And prior to your induction into the service you made California your home?

Mr. D'USSEAU. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. D'Usseau, during the course of our investigation of the entertainment field in Hollywood, several witnesses have appeared who have made reference to you. One was Martin Berkeley, who testified September 19, 1951, and if his testimony is correct you should be in a position to advise this committee regarding facts in your possession regarding the activities of the Communist Party. He identified you as a successful playwright who was a member of a group of the Communist Party.

Were you a member of a Communist Party group in Hollywood?

Mr. D'USSEAU. Mr. Tavenner, did you ever see a film called The Informer—a very fine film made by John Ford?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer my question?

Mr. D'USSEAU. If you will recall, in this film—

Mr. VELDE. The witness will be instructed, the same as other witnesses have been instructed, with reference to your answering the question by counsel—that is, if you will answer the question, you will be given an opportunity to explain your answer. If you, however, decline to answer the question, we will listen to the legal grounds for your declination. However, we will not listen to a further tirade, further observations, on your part about the work of the committee, or anything else.

We have had too much of that already cluttering up the record and taking the time of, I am sure, very busy Members of Congress who have other duties to attend to.

So, now will you answer the question or refuse to answer it on legal grounds?

(At this point Mr. D'Usseau conferred with Mr. Franse.)

Mr. D'USSEAU. I decline to answer that on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. D'Usseau, Mr. Stanley Roberts testified before this committee on May 20, 1952, that he had been a member of the Communist Party in Los Angeles and had withdrawn from the party. He described how he became a member. He stated he arrived in Hollywood in 1936 and as early as 1939 he was accustomed to go to a book store called The Book of the Day Shop. He stated at that place he met Arnaud D'Usseau and his wife, Susan.

"We," according to his testimony, "became friendly. As early as 1938 they asked me to join the party. I was rather surprised that this was the price of hospitality. I refused the invitation."

However, Mr. Roberts testified at a much later date—I think as late as 1945—he finally made the decision to come into the party, but

you were in no way connected with his ultimate decision to come into the party.

Did you attempt to recruit Mr. Roberts in the party?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I still think *The Informer* is a good picture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I decline to answer it on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you participate in any Communist Party activities prior to your entry into the service while living in Hollywood?

Mr. D'USSEAU. Mr. Tavenner, I think I've made clear that I am a writer. As a writer, I feel that when I want to state a position I should be able to do it in the context that I choose, whether it is a novel or a play or a poem or a short story.

Now, you're asking me my opinions in a context——

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Such that——

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not asking your opinions.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I feel there would have been no point to my ever becoming a writer if anybody was to dictate to me how I should answer a question. The brainwork must always be mine. Otherwise, I may as well go out and do something else.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question as to whether or not you were affiliated with the Communist Party at any time while living in Hollywood prior to 1943?

That requires only a factual answer.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well——

Mr. TAVENNER. It is not a matter of opinion.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, I told you, as a writer, I wouldn't answer it. Certainly as a citizen I am not going to either, and I will give you my reasons.

I think that they violate my rights under the first amendment, which gives me the privilege of choosing my own friends, signing what petitions I care to sign, going to what meetings I care to go to.

I understand that the first amendment is not as legally protective as it once was. Therefore, I must use the fifth and decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. L'USSEAU. I must give you the answer I have given you once before. The fifth amendment——

Mr. VELDE. In other words, you decline to answer the question——

Mr. D'USSEAU. That's correct.

Mr. VELDE. On the grounds of the fifth amendment?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Just two: When you were in the service, Mr. D'Usseau, were you an enlisted man or a commissioned officer?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I was an enlisted man. I received my basic training at Camp Crowder; later was transferred to Astoria. I was ill for a long time as a result of my basic training, and spent some months actually at Fort Totten; but my entire service was spent at Astoria.

Mr. KEARNEY. As an enlisted man?

Mr. D'USSEAU. As an enlisted man.

I was finally discharged with the rank of sergeant.

Mr. KEARNEY. Thank you. That is all.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, you have named a number of plays, some of which were anti-Nazi, as I understand it.

Mr. D'USSEAU. One.

Well, I say one directly was anti-Nazi; one by implication certainly would be.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I was just assuming others may have been.

Now, my question is this: Were any of your works anti-Communist in nature? If so, identify the work or works.

Mr. D'USSEAU. You see, you're asking for a definition here that means a lot of things to a lot of different people.

Mr. CLARDY. I will suspend that question for the moment—

Mr. D'USSEAU. So, I—

Mr. CLARDY (Continuing). And ask you this: Do you understand what I mean when I use the phrase "anti-Communist?"

Mr. D'USSEAU. No; I don't.

Mr. CLARDY. Has that—

Mr. D'USSEAU. Let me expand on that a little bit.

Now, for instance, I am for peace. You are for peace presumably. The Communists, we are told, are for peace; and, yet, you see what has happened to this word.

Yesterday I heard a man in court here say he had given up believing in words.

Where do you think that places me as a writer?

This is my coin—words.

Mr. CLARDY. All right. That is enough.

Now, I am coming back to the word or phrase "anti-Communist." As I use it, it is intended to refer to a work or works that in content opposes the Russian system or theory of government as now practiced.

Now, with that definition in mind, have you ever written any works that were anti-Communist in that sense? If so, identify them.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I—I can't answer that, Congressman. I'd like to, but—

Mr. CLARDY. Is that because you do not have any recollection or because you have not written such?

Mr. D'USSEAU. No. I mean, we're in an area of definitions here, and I find in my work definitions are extremely important, in terms of ideas and human behavior, and very complex. To state them simply takes a lot of thought and a lot of time.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, may I ask you this, then: If you do not understand that, how can you be so sure that what you wrote was anti-Nazi, because that is an area that requires considerable definition also?

Mr. D'USSEAU. It indeed does. It indeed does. Tomorrow the World, I actually think took me about 12 years to—

Mr. CLARDY. To figure that out?

Mr. D'USSEAU. To find precisely the way to dramatize the Nazi point of view.

Mr. CLARDY. I am not talking about how long it took you to dramatize it. Did it take you 12 years to understand what the word Nazi stood for?

Mr. D'USSEAU. In all its implications, yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Oh, it did?

Mr. D'USSEAU. In all its implications, yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you yet understand what the Communist Party stands for here in the United States?

And I am not talking about anything but the United States.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Congressman, if you would like to get on the radio and debate this, I would be glad to—

Mr. CLARDY. No; I am not asking you to debate it.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, I think there the atmosphere would be equal. I don't think—

Mr. CLARDY. I am just asking you if you understand what the American Communist Party stands for today. You can answer that "yes" or "no."

Mr. D'USSEAU. I don't believe any of these questions can be answered "yes" or "no."

Mr. CLARDY. You can't answer that one?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I certainly am not going to.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, for one thing, don't you recognize the fact that the Communist Party, the international, is anti-Semitic to the extreme today?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I do know this: That there is no—

Mr. CLARDY. Just answer that "yes" or "no."

Mr. D'USSEAU. All right. I say I don't think it is.

Mr. CLARDY. You do not?

Mr. D'USSEAU. No; and I'll tell you why. First of all, in its constitution there are definite laws about anti-Semitism; also, I have no proof that this anti-Semitism exists.

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt you, Mr. Clardy—

Mr. CLARDY. Surely.

Mr. SCHERER. Just to fortify that?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. You said you had no proof. This committee, though, has been sitting, at least since I have been a member of the committee, Mr. Witness, for 4 months, and during that time this committee has listened to a considerable number of prominent Jewish educators—some who have been former members of the Communist Party, and some who have not—and those men have testified under oath before this committee that the Communist Party was as anti-Semitic as the Nazi Party ever was, and then they offered corroborating statements to prove what they said.

Now, that has been the testimony before this committee in the last 3 months by prominent Jewish laymen—

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, there is Rabbi Silver—

Mr. SCHERER. And professors.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Let me answer that.

There is Rabbi Silver who is, as I understand it, a Republican. He gave the—he was one of the ministers that—at Eisenhower's inaugural, inauguration. He, from what I understand in the press, doesn't believe that there is official anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

Now, this is a man who is a Republican and, in no way, I think, can be considered a nonconformist, as I consider myself, but a conservative.

Now, I would like to elaborate.

I am interested in movies and the theater. There was a director named Eisenstein. I believe he is a Jew. This man was given millions upon millions of rubles, or dollars, to make any number of pictures. I don't think this suggests that there is anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

What happened to the Jewish artists in Nazi Germany?

Mr. SCHERER. Well—

Mr. D'USSEAU. They weren't given this same privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Oh, I am granting—

Mr. D'USSEAU. And there are a number of Jewish writers—

Mr. SCHERER. Wait a minute.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I know—

Mr. SCHERER. There is no question about the anti-Semitism of the Nazis—no question about that—and we all condemn that. What I am telling you, as a matter of fact, that it has been the testimony—

Mr. D'USSEAU. What would you call Rabbi Silver's reaction?

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Before this committee.

Mr. D'USSEAU. What would you call Rabbi Silver's reaction?

Mr. SCHERER. I haven't heard Rabbi Silver's—

Mr. D'USSEAU. I happen to have heard him.

Mr. SCHERER. I haven't heard him, but I have heard and listened to the testimony of prominent Jewish men before this committee over the last few months—

Mr. D'USSEAU. Let me put it this way—

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Who stated exactly what I said.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Will you agree with what I told you—there may be divided opinion about this?

Mr. SCHERER. Well, there may be divided opinion.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, that's very important.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I couldn't help but notice, Mr. D'Usseau, that you said you were a nonconformist—and perhaps I am one also, more than other ways, because in the history of my nation I think I recognize that nonconformists and those who have sincerely differed and believed in the difference of opinion to the extent of putting it in practice have contributed much to the history of my nation. So, the fact that you are a nonconformist—and proud of it—doesn't scare me at all.

Mr. D'USSEAU. It wasn't intended to scare you.

Mr. DOYLE. Perhaps I shouldn't use the word "scare." I didn't mean scare, but it doesn't mean at all I necessarily differ with a person who is a nonconformist.

I think it is important that we do have nonconformists—and God forbid the time when in my nation we all think alike. I certainly don't expect always to think alike even with all other Members of Congress, of which I have been a Member now going on 7 years.

But may I just say this to you: I am wondering if you won't give us, as a congressional committee, the benefit of your cooperation in this area. We are sent here under Public Law 601, passed in 1945, by your Congress, your United States Congress, in which this committee is here charged with looking into the extent and the character—and I am using the exact words of the statute—looking into the extent and character—and the objects of subversive propaganda and activities in the United States, whether those activities and that propaganda

originate domestically in the United States or foreign countries; and then we are also charged under Public Law 601 with looking into any other question with relation to these subversive activities which may bear on the subject of aiding Congress in any remedial legislation. Then, finally, this committee is charged, under Public Law 601, with reporting back to the United States Congress any recommendation we may arrive at.

Now, I noticed you referred to that picture—The Informer—which you wrote.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I didn't say I wrote it. I said I thought it was a good picture.

Mr. DOYLE. Well—

Mr. D'USSEAU. It was written by Lem O'Flaherty, and I think the screen play was done by Dudley Nichols, and it was directed by John Ford.

Mr. DOYLE. All right, but I noticed at that time you referred to that picture—

Mr. D'USSEAU. It's a classic.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). In using that, in the first instance, in answer to the question, indicating that you wouldn't answer the question because it would put you in the class of being an informer.

I just assume by inference, at least, that is what you meant.

If you were a Member of Congress and assigned to the important duties of this committee, how would you get the facts about subversive activities of people and programs in the United States unless you asked people to cooperate with you as a Member of Congress in ascertaining what the facts were about subversive activities of individuals, no matter who the individuals are and what the groups are?

How would you get that information if you didn't expect—and have a right to expect—the cooperation of patriotic Americans in giving a congressional committee the extent of their knowledge? How would you get it?

Mr. D'USSEAU. I'm very happy you asked me that. I was hoping you would. All of my life I've believed in peace. I've been opposed to racial discrimination.

Mr. DOYLE. Well—

Mr. D'USSEAU. I believe in the vote. I believe in the good American things that I learned in school. I don't think that these are—in any way constitute crimes—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, neither do we, sir.

Mr. D'USSEAU. And, then, the petitions I have signed are for decent, human things, in which lives were concerned.

I believe—well, let me put it this way: I believe the greatest passage in all literature is when King Lear realizes he is one with the poor, that he shares the same fate as those of the houseless heads and the unfed scions.

I believe this as an American and as a thinking, moral human being.

Now, I've been brought here presumably because I believe in these ideas.

Mr. DOYLE. Not at all, sir.

Mr. D'USSEAU. In some cases, I have tried—

Mr. DOYLE. No; no.

Mr. D'USSEAU. To carry them out.

Mr. DOYLE. No, Mr. D'Usseau.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I will tell you something——

Mr. DOYLE. Let me——

Mr. D'USSEAU. I will tell you something——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Of why I became a nonconformist.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, Mr. D'Usseau——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, he is not answering the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't mean to interrupt——

Mr. CLARDY. He is making a speech.

Mr. DOYLE. Or be impolite——

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). And I ask that he be instructed to desist.

Mr. DOYLE. But I don't want you to take any advantage of my question, because I am not asking a question to deliberately open up an invitation or area for you to give a long statement. That manifestly is not my purpose.

But you and I are both Californians. I was born and raised in California, too—Los Angeles County—and, you see, when you say you believe in peace, some of us are fathers and mothers of boys who have already given their lives for peace in the uniform of the United States military.

I am one of those fathers who has given a son.

So, I don't think less likely of peace than you do, sir; but I want to remind you of my question.

I am a member of a congressional committee that is assigned to do a certain, specific job by your Congress—and it is not an easy job, may I assure you. We are not here and we didn't subpoena you because of your being a nonconformist—I assure you—but we did subpoena you because we had, we believed, sufficient evidence under oath to identify you at one time, whether you are now or not, as a member of a group of people in your country and mine who were or are, it appears, subversive in their intent and objectives.

Now, we, therefore, subpoenaed you because we believe the evidence, uncontradicted, is that you were a member of the Communist Party.

Now, we are not saying you are now, sir; but I personally believe, from listening to you, that you are in a position to help us get the facts about the activities of the Communist Party at one time in your experience—and that is what we are asking you to do.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Now, let me see if I understand the question correctly. You are asking me, in effect, what I think is subversive; is that right?

Mr. DOYLE. We are asking you to help us get at the manner in which the Communist Party functioned in Hollywood or elsewhere while you were a member of the Communist Party, if you were.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Congressman, that isn't my understanding of what the committee's function is.

I don't deny the committee has been given the right to investigate——

Mr. DOYLE. Well, here it is——

Mr. D'USSEAU. Under the law.

I say I agree with that——

Mr. DOYLE. Well, here it is——



Mr. D'USSEAU. But the thing they have been asked to do is investigate subversive activities.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct, and—

Mr. D'USSEAU. All right; now, let's follow the thing logically. It comes down to what was considered subversive.

Now, I, for instance, consider any use of violence, such as the Ku Klux Klan enjoys, as subversive.

Yesterday there was a witness who was talking about Gerald L. K. Smith. Now, this is a horrible individual, in my opinion, is this subversive individual. He doesn't stand for the things American that I understand.

What we are really discussing here, it seems to me, is what constitutes subversion.

Now, I cannot believe, under any circumstances, that the things I have spoken for—

I don't want to go into a speech. I am trying to avoid speeches. I don't like them either. When you are writing a play, you try to get it short and you try to keep it brief.

But what we have got to do here is define our terms—and I am saying what you consider subversive is not what I consider subversive.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, then, let me say to you point-blank that we know the objectives of the Communist Party in the United States are and have been for many years subversive.

Now, we subpoenaed you here because we believe the uncontroverted evidence is that at one time at least you were a member of the Communist Party.

You might have been, sir, in my judgment, a member of the Communist Party without you individually being subversive in your intent.

I have come to the point where I recognize at a certain time in the history of my Nation—when Russia was an ally, for instance, of ours—there were people in the United States who were very kindly toward Soviet Russia; but ever since May 1945, I will say to you very frankly, I don't see how in God's world any patriotic American can stay in the Communist Party in America—since May 1945, which was the time when Earl Browder was deposed and kicked out because of his difference under the Duclos letter.

Now, I mustn't take more time of the committee, but I know you are in a position, as a brainy writer, to help your United States Congress know much about subversive activity in this country—and that is what I am urging you to do.

I am not going to sit here and still believe you are a member of the Communist Party because I have come to the conclusion: In my judgment, I can't understand how in God's name any patriotic American citizen who has any brains that God gave him at all, and tries to use those brains, can stay in the Communist Party, since May 1945.

So, I am not going to insult you by even inferring you are still a member of the Communist Party; but, under oath, we have the testimony of people who are not stoolpigeons, but who came to the point where they thought more of their country's security than otherwise and, so, they now are labeled as stoolpigeons and informers.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I respect the fact you are a Congressman, but I think you are also a servant of the people.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Mr. D'USSEAU. You are my servant——

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Mr. D'USSEAU. And you have no right to give me this advice——

Mr. DOYLE. I haven't——

Mr. D'USSEAU. If I don't choose to have it, and in this case I don't choose to have it.

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Mr. D'USSEAU. And I don't want to get into speeches. The chairman has said we don't want speeches.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't care to take any more of your time.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Now, you said—what you have done—you have made a speech——

Mr. DOYLE. No.

Mr. D'USSEAU. And I am not making—I am not permitted to make a speech.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I haven't——

Mr. D'USSEAU. If you make a speech, it's a speech.

Mr. DOYLE. Made any speech.

Mr. D'USSEAU. If I try to make a speech——

Mr. DOYLE. I have simply prefaced——

Mr. D'USSEAU. Or try to answer a question, it's a tirade.

Mr. DOYLE. And explained the basis of my question, so as not to embarrass you, not to do anything but to give you an honest-to-God chance in public to help your own congressional committee in the study we are assigned to make.

That is all I ask you to do—not to give your opinions about anything.

Mr. D'USSEAU. How can I do that?

I've been opposed to this committee ever since its inception.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, why don't you——

Mr. D'USSEAU. I have been opposed to it ever since Secretary Ickes said, when Dies headed it, he was in the wrong tent.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, Mr. D'Usseau——

Mr. D'USSEAU. I was opposed to it when Roosevelt was against it. I've always been opposed to it.

Mr. VELDE. With all respect to the gentleman from California, I can see where the work of this committee is not being furthered——

Mr. DOYLE. I think you are right.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. By any additional testimony from this witness. It is apparent he was a member of the Communist Party and has a lot of information. It is also very apparent he will refuse to give it to his congressional committee, and I see no further need——

Mr. DOYLE. I think it has helped to this extent, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. VELDE. For further argument, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I think it has helped to this extent: That this American citizen certainly realizes we are not subpoenaing him because he may be a nonconformist.

Mr. D'USSEAU. Well, I think——

Mr. DOYLE. You have learned that much at least about the committee.

Mr. D'USSEAU. I don't want to hide behind the word "nonconformist." I use that word perhaps because I saw it in the paper this morning in connection with another news story.

If you want to use the word "radical"—any word you want to use—that is your business.

All I can say is this: That there have always been people who are in the minority, who have dissented. I think any writer who is worth his salt is critical of our society.

I believe, with Shelley, that the poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

Mr. VELDE. You are getting into the field that is entirely foreign to our hearing here today, and our purpose.

Mr. Frazier, do you have any questions?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, is there any reason why this witness shouldn't be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is excused.

Call the next witness, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome Robbins.

Mr. VELDE. Will you stand and be sworn?

Will you raise your right hand, please?

In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ROBBINS. So help me.

Mr. VELDE. I understand you desire the lights be turned off.

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

### TESTIMONY OF JEROME ROBBINS, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, R. LAWRENCE SIEGEL

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. ROBBINS. Jerome Robbins.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell your last name?

Mr. ROBBINS. R-o-b-b-i-n-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. Jerome Robbins?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. SIEGEL. R. Lawrence Siegel, 55 Liberty Street, New York 5, N. Y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, when and where were you born, Mr. Robbins?

Mr. ROBBINS. I was born in New York—here at New York—1918.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. ROBBINS. I am a choreographer and a dancer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been engaged in the profession of a choreographer?

Mr. ROBBINS. As a choreographer since 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been, generally, and also in preparation for your profession?

Mr. ROBBINS. I attended grammar school and high school in Weehawken, N. J.; graduated there. I attended NYU, Washington

Square College, 1 year, in preparation for my profession. I was a dancer since 1937, studying all different kinds of dancing. I studied music.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, a better understanding of the nature of your profession—that is, what type of work it is—

MR. ROBBINS. Choreography—

MR. TAVENNER (continuing). And just how you engage in your work?

MR. ROBBINS. Well, choreographer is the technical word for creating dances, the same way as one would create a play or create music for a show.

I conceive the ideas for the dances, create the steps, and instruct the dancers how to perform them, and then direct the performers.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you illustrate it a little more definitely, as to the exact character of the work you have to do in designing the dances?

MR. ROBBINS. Well, I work in two fields—both in Broadway, as far as musical comedy is concerned, and in the ballet field.

I am represented on Broadway now by *The King and I*. In that show I had the problem of creating a ballet which was *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, but done in terms of the Siamese dancing, the way a Siamese court would do it, and I had to do some research on it, study the movements, make the point of the book, within the ballet itself, the story of the ballet.

As far as the ballet field is concerned, I will have an idea for a ballet, select the music or have someone write it, conceive it, choreograph it, produce it finally.

MR. TAVENNER. Then, that type of work requires a highly creative art, doesn't it?

MR. ROBBINS. I think it is a highly creative art; yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the names of some of your principal productions?

MR. ROBBINS. On Broadway I have done the dances for *On The Town*, *Million-Dollar Baby*, *High Button Shoes*, *Call Me Madam*, *Miss Liberty*, *The King and I*, *Two is Company*.

In the ballet I have done the ballets *Fancy Free*, *Interplay*, *Facsimile*, *Age of Anxiety*, *The Pied Piper*, *The Cage*.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you done this work in any countries beside the United States?

MR. ROBBINS. Yes. My ballets have been toured in Europe—most all the countries in Europe. I don't believe they've been performed in Mexico or Canada. That's about it.

MR. TAVENNER. What was your first ballet?

MR. ROBBINS. My first ballet was *Fancy Free*. It was created in 1944.

MR. TAVENNER. Was that the ballet which brought you prominence in your field?

MR. ROBBINS. Yes; it did. It was an immediate success, and I received a lot of attention because of it.

MR. TAVENNER. When did that go on the stage?

MR. ROBBINS. It was performed here in New York at the Metropolitan Opera House on April 18, 1944.

MR. TAVENNER. April 1944.

The investigation that the committee has undertaken has disclosed information indicating that you were at one time a member of the Communist Party. Is that information correct?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes; it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. For how long a period were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROBBINS. I made application to the Communist Party—the Communist Association—

Mr. TAVENNER. Communist Political Association?

Mr. ROBBINS (continuing). Association—yes—around Christmas, 1943.

I attended my first meeting in the spring of 1944; the last meeting I attended, too, which was the only one I did, was in 1947, which was in the spring of that year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, the committee is very anxious to know from your experience in the Communist Party from 1944 to 1947 just how the Communist Party functioned in your field—that is, what the purpose of the Communist Party was in securing you as a member, so far as we can ascertain, what use it made of you, if it made any use of you, and what influence, if any, it attempted to bring to bear on you as a member of your profession.

Mr. ROBBINS. Well—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us first begin by your telling the committee just, in your own way, what your experiences were in the Communist Party.

Mr. ROBBINS. I belonged to a group which was known as the theatrical transient group.

Mr. TAVENNER. A theatrical transient group?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes—well named because the group shifted around a lot. There was a shift of people within it; a shift of meeting places. It was divided and subdivided many times. It was part of the cultural division.

As far as the way they tried to influence me or use me, at one of the earliest meetings I attended I was asked in what way did dialectical materialism help me do Fancy Free.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what connection were you asked that question?

Mr. ROBBINS. Someone came up to me and just asked me this after a meeting—oh, whether I would give—someone asked me whether I would give a lecture on this to the club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, that was as to how dialectical materialism influenced you in the production of Fancy Free—

Mr. ROBBINS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Which had been a huge success?

Mr. ROBBINS. That's right.

I had prepared Fancy Free before attending any meetings of the association, and I found the question a little ridiculous and a little outrageous.

Mr. DOYLE. May I hear that?

I didn't hear the last part.

Mr. ROBBINS. I said I attended—I had created Fancy Free before I had become a member of the political association, and I found the question ridiculous and outrageous, both.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. You had not been a member of the Communist Party when you created that ballet?

Mr. ROBBINS. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. But the assumption was, by at least some members of your group, that if you were a good Communist you would have permitted dialectical materialism to influence you in the production——

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Of your work?

Mr. ROBBINS. I was asked to describe how dialectical materialism had helped me make *Fancy Free*.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, will you tell the committee, briefly, about that ballet, of which you spoke, so that we may know what the Communist Party had in mind when you were asked that question of the effect——

Mr. ROBBINS. *Fancy Free*——

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Of dialectical materialism?

Mr. ROBBINS (continuing). Is about three sailors on shore leave in New York for the first time.

This ballet was ultimately made into a show called *On the Town*, and finally into a movie called *On the Town*.

The idea was mine. The purpose of it was to show how an American material and American spirit and American warmth and our dancing, our folk dancing, which is a part of jitterbugging, part of jazz, could be used in an art form. The story concerns these three boys in New York for the first time, having a good time, trying to pick up some girls.

It's always been identified everywhere it's played as a particularly American piece, indigenous to America, and that its theme has great heart and warmth, as far as representing our culture is concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you, as I understand, had a feeling of resentment when you were asked to lecture upon the effect of communism upon the production of that ballet?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes, sir. I thought it was a—I had to laugh.

I don't think I answered. I laughed back at this person and said that, in my opinion, there was no connection. I couldn't possibly do this as I didn't see what one had to do with the other.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you did not attempt to make the lecture?

Mr. ROBBINS. Not in the least; no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you acquire the feeling that the Communist Party was endeavoring to influence you in your product—the product of your enterprise?

Mr. ROBBINS. I believe this was part of the Communist attempt. I feel that constantly you are subjugated to propaganda and influence to make your art carry a political message; that the instances of this becoming apparent to me happened over the years.

At the point there was the Albert Maltz letter. He had written an article why the artist should be free to write what he wants to write about and how he wants to write it. This was severely criticized in the *New Masses* and the *Daily Worker*, and finally Maltz retracted. This became the subject of many meetings and much discussion back and forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. Among your own group?

Mr. ROBBINS. Among my own group; yes.

I could not understand how the Soviet musicians could be accused of writing—I think the word—formalistic music and bourgeois music, having to repent publicly and then get a benediction to move on and continue composing.

I found this intolerable to an artist. I feel that they must be allowed to say what they want to say as they feel it, and that the minute they become subject to any dictums they're being false.

Mr. SIEGEL. May I refresh his memory as to one more incident?

Mr. VELDE. Yes; certainly you may confer.

(At this point Mr. Robbins conferred with Mr. Siegel.)

Mr. ROBBINS. Oh, yes—I attended one meeting in which someone reported to me that the meeting before a very great American dancer, not in the least Communist, had been called The Face of Facism. I have the highest respect for this woman who was accused of portraying The Face to Fascism.

This again floored me. I didn't understand what it was about, and it again brought forth this procedure to label things which did not conform fascistic, bourgeois, decadent, degenerate; other things which did conform, whether they were artistic or not, were seemingly praised.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, did you discover, during the course of your experience in the party, any purposes that the Communist Party had in mind with respect to yourself?

Mr. ROBBINS. No, sir; not—I was—I was just always at meetings where this issue was kind of constantly brought forth; but outside of this one time, when I was asked to lecture, I did not receive any orders to make my work conform to their plans, their lines.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one question there?

Do I understand that, even though Fancy Free had been written, conceived, and written, by you prior to the time you were a member of the Communist Party, after you became a member of the Communist Party you received orders, as you have just said, to give a lecture on how dialectical materialism or communism had influenced you to write Fancy Free?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes; that's right.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, even though it had no influence on you, you received orders to give a lecture before other Communists that this——

Mr. ROBBINS. This was not an order, sir. This was a request.

Mr. DOYLE. A request.

Mr. ROBBINS. It didn't—it did not happen at the meeting. I want to put it straight, but someone did ask me to make a lecture to this effect after I had composed the ballet.

Mr. DOYLE. Knowing you had composed it before you were ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you requested at any other time to take part in any other meeting as a speaker?

Mr. ROBBINS. No; not by the party.

Mr. SIEGEL. May I refresh the witness' memory at this point.

(At this point Mr. Robbins conferred with Mr. Siegel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you had not appeared as a speaker for the Communist Party at any occasion, or on any other occasion?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you this: During the period of your membership did you come to the belief or the opinion that, as a Communist Party member, you should join front organizations?

Mr. ROBBINS. At the time I was a member there was a lot of talk at the meetings about these organizations and that we should all attend them.

I did join a large number of front organizations.

I did not realize or conceive that they were front organizations to the effect that these were instigated by Communists and attempted to be controlled by them. I did realize Communists participated in them, but I was very much in favor of the things that they apparently stood for.

Mr. TAVENNER. How active were you in the front organizations—

Mr. ROBBINS. Not very.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing.) Which you joined?

Mr. ROBBINS. Not very.

Mr. CLARDY. Too busy with your workaday life, I take it?

Mr. ROBBINS. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, will you tell the committee, please, what were the circumstances under which you first joined the Communist Party? What was the inducement that led you into the Communist Party?

Mr. ROBBINS. The Communist Association—Political Association—had been presented to me as an organization which was very much for minorities and for advancing their causes. This interested me very much.

I had had, prior to my joining, several instances of very painful moments because of minority prejudice.

This was naturally an appeal for me.

Mr. SCHERER. In other words, it was represented to you that the Communist Party at that time was opposed to anti-Semitism?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. That was one of your reasons for joining?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And if you had not had those experiences which you mentioned you may not have gone to the Communist Party?

Mr. ROBBINS. Perhaps not.

It also was fighting fascism, and fascism and anti-Semitism—

Mr. SCHERER. Were synonymous.

Mr. ROBBINS (continuing). Were synonymous to me.

It also gave one the feeling that the artist under communism was a very free and secure person economically.

I don't believe that, for the reasons I've already stated—

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt again?

Do you believe still today that the Communist Party is opposed to anti-Semitism?

Mr. ROBBINS. May I answer it this way: In the past two summers I have traveled to Israel to teach there and to give what aid I can to that country as far as my talent is concerned. In the light of the recent purges and waves of anti-Semitism, no; I do not believe—



Mr. SCHERER. You would say today, as other witnesses have said to this committee in the last 4 months, that the Communist Party is as anti-Semitic as the Nazi Party ever was?

Mr. ROBBINS. It appears to be that way.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you were telling us of the reasons why you went into the Communist Party.

Mr. ROBBINS. And the other reason was that it was now frankly called the Communist Political Association, and I was given to believe that this organization, the association, was striving to make out of communism an American form of communism and that it would coordinate with other political parties rather than be as secretive a thing as the Communist Party became when it changed back again.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Robbins—

Mr. CLARDY. That is one thing I meant to suggest to you earlier. The change from a Communist Party to the association and back again, I think, ought to be—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Laid out pretty clear here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Now, was there a time when you found that those representations that had been made to you at the time you entered the party were not true?

Mr. ROBBINS. If you're asking if I can put my finger specifically on those moments—no, sir; I can't.

I did not like the shift from the association back to the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why?

Mr. ROBBINS. Because it seemed to be—becoming more secretive. I did not understand the secrecy. I—my own feelings were that I wanted to put everything aboveboard, to be able to say, "Yes; I am a Communist," and when it shifted back I did not understand the shift.

As a matter of fact, I did not understand why Earl Browder was no longer the head of it and somebody else was. This was never explained clearly to me, and the shifts of policy were very disturbing to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you have told the committee that in 1947 you attended your last meeting.

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been connected or affiliated in any way with the Communist Party since that meeting?

Mr. ROBBINS. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what brought about the termination of your relationship with the Communist Party?

Mr. ROBBINS. Well, I suppose that the final—the final straw was this last meeting. All these other reasons had been building up.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other reasons?

Mr. ROBBINS. One: There was no longer the association, but now it had become the party and had become smaller in its scope.

Two: That the artist was not free; that he wasn't—that he became a puppet to the Communist line, Communist propaganda.

There was the attempt to move everything that way.

Three: I did not feel it was working for minorities but had used it as a propaganda to get people into the party.

At this last meeting which I attended a fight broke out—not a fist fight—and this fight had to do with parliamentary procedure, and everyone began arguing and yelling, and I suddenly realized I was in the midst of chaos, of an unorganized, frantic group. The personalities there became involved with each other. I just thought it was too much, that I—I didn't know what I was doing here, or what I was accomplishing by being present, and I had no more interest in continuing to participate.

Mr. VELDE. I believe, Mr. Tavenner, this might be a good place to adjourn over until tomorrow morning.

I wonder if the witness can return tomorrow morning.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TAVENNER. I only have 3 or 4 more questions.

Mr. KEARNEY. If he has only got 3 or 4 more questions——

Mr. TAVENNER. Just as you like.

Mr. VELDE. All right. Proceed, then.

Mr. SIEGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask you a few more brief questions.

Who recruited you into the party?

Mr. ROBBINS. Miss Lettie Stever.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons were members of this group at the time you joined?

Mr. ROBBINS. The personnel shifted constantly, sir. It would vary anywhere between 10 to 20.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many meetings in all do you think you attended?

Mr. ROBBINS. I think I attended 20 meetings over that period. I was busy with my work, going in and out of town.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make any attempt to study communism?

Mr. ROBBINS. No. I was supposed to read Marx and Lenin, but I never did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of other persons who were in this group whom you can identify?

Mr. ROBBINS. Lloyd Gough.

Mr. TAVENNER. Lloyd Gough—G-o-u-g-h?

Mr. ROBBINS. I think that is the way you pronounce it.

Lionel Berman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Lionel——

Mr. ROBBINS. Berman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Berman?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. B-e-r-m-a-n?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know where Mr. Berman is?

Mr. ROBBINS. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not he was a functionary in the party?

Mr. ROBBINS. He was identified as an organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of others—or let me ask you the question this way: You said a party member asked you to what extent dialectical materialism influenced you in the production of Fancy Free.

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was that person?

Mr. ROBBINS. Madeline Lee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Madeline Lee?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the last name?

Mr. ROBBINS. L-e-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. L-e-e.

Can you recall the names of other persons?

Mr. ROBBINS. Elliot Sullivan.

Mr. TAVENNER. Elliot Sullivan.

Do you know how Elliot Sullivan was employed?

Mr. ROBBINS. I believe he was an actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, now will you give us—

Mr. ROBBINS. Edna Ocko.

Mr. TAVENNER. Edna Ocko—O-e-k-o?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was she employed?

Mr. ROBBINS. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. How can you identify her as a member? Is there any particular incident?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes. She was in the middle of this last argument at the last meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1947?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. ROBBINS. Jerome Chodorov.

Mr. TAVENNER. Jerome Chodorov.

Mr. ROBBINS. And Edward Chodorov.

Mr. TAVENNER. Edward Chodorov.

Mr. ROBBINS. They both were at this last meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with the names of all the persons who were members of your group?

Mr. ROBBINS. No; I did not. Last names were not used usually and, as I say, I attended meetings sporadically and the people at the meetings changed about, so that a first name might be all I would know of someone's identity.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever requested to rejoin the Communist Party after you left?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes—not to rejoin. Mr. Chodorov asked me whether I was coming back. I said, "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Which Mr. Chodorov?

Mr. ROBBINS. Jerome.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to express my own thanks to the witness for his very frank and honest testimony before the committee this afternoon. I will say it was a bit unusual.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I want to join with that, but also say I appreciate some of the work that I now know you are responsible for.

Mr. ROBBINS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Just this, Mr. Robbins: You said the Communist Party at about the time you joined pretended to be interested in the grievances of minority groups for the purpose of gaining converts.

That was the import of your testimony, was it?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, could it also have been for the purpose of gaining funds or money from some sources?

Mr. ROBBINS. Might have been, sir. I am not cognizant of it.

Mr. SCHERER. Thank you.

I might say I am going to see The King and I tonight, and I will appreciate it much more.

Mr. ROBBINS. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to join in heartily complimenting you on doing what you have done.

May I ask you this one question: We have had men and women before us today and yesterday who have referred to people who have come and testified before us and have not claimed the constitutional provisions and who have named other people as stoolpigeons and informers. You realize, no doubt, that when you volunteered the names of other Communists whom you knew to be Communists that you would, by those people at least, be put in that class.

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you did it with your eyes open?

Mr. ROBBINS. I did it according to my conscience.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I have a very personal question—and I have never met you; I have never talked with you before, have I?

Mr. ROBBINS. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, then, let me ask you: What is it in your conscience, or what was it in your experience, that makes you certainly one of the top men in your profession, one who has reached the pinnacle in your art, willing to come here and, in spite of the fact that you knew some other people, who claim to be artists or authors or musicians, would put you down as a stoolpigeon, and voluntarily testify as you have today?

Mr. ROBBINS. I've examined myself. I think I made a great mistake before in entering the Communist Party, and I feel that I am doing the right thing as an American.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you feel you are doing the right thing as an American?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, so do I.

Again I want to compliment you.

Now, let me say this, too: You are in a wonderful place, through your art, your music, your talent, which God blessed you with, to perhaps be very vigorous and positive in promoting Americanism in contrast to communism. Let me suggest to you that you use that great talent which God has blessed you with to put into ballets in some way, to put into music in some way, that interpretation.

Mr. ROBBINS. Sir, all my works have been acclaimed for its American quality particularly.

Mr. DOYLE. I realize that, but let me urge you to even put more of that in it where you can appropriately.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. Nothing further.

Mr. VELDE. I don't think I can add anything to what has been said to you by my colleagues on the committee, Mr. Robbins, but I do want to reiterate you have performed a patriotic service to the committee and I am sure all Congress and the American people are very thankful to you for it.

Mr. Counsel, are there any instructions you have for witnesses for further on in the week that you might announce for those who might be in the hearing room at the present time?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir, other than any witnesses not reached today should be here tomorrow.

Mr. VELDE. Yes, at 10 o'clock.

The witness is excused, with the committee's thanks.

The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:36 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Wednesday, April 6, 1953.)



# INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA—PART 2

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*New York, N. Y.*

## EXECUTIVE SESSION <sup>1</sup>

The Committee on Un-American Activities met at 2:30 p. m., in room 1101, United States courthouse, Foley Square, New York City, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee member present: Representative Harold H. Velde.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Leslie C. Scott, of the research department; and Dolores Anderson, committee reporter.

Mr. VELDE. Let the record show I appointed myself as a subcommittee of one for the purpose of hearing the testimony of Mrs. Burrows.

Will you stand and be sworn, please, Mrs. Burrows? Do you solemnly swear, that in the testimony you are about to give, to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. BURROWS. I do.

Mr. VELDE. Be seated, please.

## TESTIMONY OF CARIN KINZEL BURROWS (MRS. ABE BURROWS), ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, MARTIN GANG

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please?

Mrs. BURROWS. Carin Kinsel Burrows.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

Mrs. BURROWS. In Cadillac, Mich.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. BURROWS. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself?

Mr. GANG. Yes, I am Mr. Martin Gang, attorney at law.

Mr. TAVENNER. What occupation or profession have you followed, Mrs. Burrows?

Mrs. BURROWS. I have been an actress. I have done radio writing and directing, and I have been an assistant director in the theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe to the committee, please, in a little more detail, just what the nature of your professional career has been?

<sup>1</sup> Released by the committee on the same day.

Mrs. BURROWS. I am not sure I know what you want. Would you like a list of the places I have worked?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, if you would tell us more of the character of the work you have performed, and over what period, I believe that would answer our purposes.

Mrs. BURROWS. Well, I always wanted to work in the theater or show business in some capacity, mainly acting. I wanted to be an actress, but after starting the career of acting, I had to give it up, at one point, so I transferred my interest to the other side of the show life and tried to become a professional director in the theater and radio.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that change in your professional career take place?

Mrs. BURROWS. I would say in my early twenties about the early 1940's.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, just what has been your formal educational training?

Mrs. BURROWS. I graduated from high school in 1937 and went 1 year to the University of Washington, where I majored in drama, and 1 year at a private drama school in Hollywood, and 1 semester to Hunter College in New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you begin your theatrical career?

Mrs. BURROWS. I began acting in a little theater in Seattle and at the University of Washington, where they had 2 full-time theaters, and then when I left the school, I joined the Little Theater in Seattle. This was nonprofessional. I wasn't paid for any work at that time, which is one reason I went into radio, so I could make a living—which I wasn't able to do in the theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Burrows, during the course of our committee investigations, a person by the name of Carin Kinzel was identified as having been a member of a radio group of the Communist Party in Hollywood. Are you the person referred to as Carin Kinzel?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, I believe I am.

Mrs. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the Communist Party at any time?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, I have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that first occur?

Mrs. BURROWS. I joined the Communist Party in Seattle in, I believe, 1940—to the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think it well to state for the record that I prefer not to ask questions at this time regarding her experiences in Seattle, because that will be the matter for further investigation, and until some more work is done we would prefer not to go into that subject.

Mr. VELDE. Yes, that leave is granted.

(At this point Counsel Gang asked permission to make a statement for the record.)

Counsel GANG. May I ask that you put in the record that Mrs. Burrows has given all the material known to her, and has expressed her desire to cooperate in all matters as to her knowledge about her Communist Party membership?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, that is correct. Now, without telling us of what you know regarding Seattle, will you give the committee a narrative of your experience in the Communist Party?



Mrs. BURROWS. Yes. My experience in Seattle was largely tied in with my theater work. When I left the theater, I left the party—at that time I think that would be in the winter of 1941 or 1942. When I went to work in the radio station, I lost all contact with the theater group, and therefore, the party. In the fall of 1943 I decided to go to Hollywood and pursue my career there. I was very frightened about it. I made the acquaintance of several girls there. There was one, Marjorie McGregor. We had gone to school together and were classmates at the University of Washington, and had gone to drama school at Hunter College. We had corresponded infrequently, off and on. When I arrived in Hollywood I looked her up and she was very friendly. I met most of her friends, and they were nice to me. One of her friends sent me to RKO to the talent coach there. Some one else sent me to someone at the Hollywood Democratic Committee when they found I had some radio experience. I was sent to a George Pepper, who, I believe, was the executive secretary of the Hollywood Democratic Committee, and he interviewed me and said I could handle the job, so I was hired. I was supposed to be paid, but the salary was very irregular. The work was stimulating and exciting, and I enjoyed it. My work consisted of campaigning for Roosevelt in the 1944 elections, and I went all over the State. My work was in the field of radio and was to write scripts, act in them, and put on radio shows, and make spot announcements and recordings for the various Democratic candidates. I not only enjoyed the campaigning, but I was very much behind President Roosevelt. I also had a chance to meet and work with many of the top people in radio in Hollywood and found it very valuable experience. I was able to direct many productions and act in them, and after I started doing this—at some point shortly after—I was asked to attend meetings of the radio group of the Communist Party in Hollywood.

Mr. VELDE. May I ask, Mrs. Burrows, what stage name you used at that time?

Mrs. BURROWS. Carin Kinzel was my name. I began attending some of these meetings more regularly at that time, and I didn't wholly affiliate with them at that time. The meetings were very similar to the meetings and work I was doing with the Hollywood Democratic Committee at that time. We talked about how to help the war effort, to elect the Democratic slate, and President Roosevelt, in the elections.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you approximate the year in which you worked there?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes; I think this would be toward the end or practically the end of 1943, and the beginning of 1944. I attended some of these meetings, off and on, until sometime in 1944 it would be, I think. It was spring—spring or summer—sometime around there. The Communist Party was dissolved and re-formed into the Communist Political Association. At that time I decided to join that, and I rejoined—

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time—

Mrs. BURROWS. Excuse me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Complete your sentence.

Mrs. BURROWS. And I filled out a card and became a member of the Communist Political Association.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you made your decision to become a member of the Communist Party, were you still working for the Hollywood Democratic Committee?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, I was, and I would just like to remind you that the Communist Political Association was somewhat different from the Communist Party—in fact, I felt, completely different from the Communist Party—and that it was a rather loose and open organization, with open meetings and no secrecy of any kind, no conspiracy of any kind, and their avowed principles were actually more or less reform principles, and their main activity—or the things they talked about—were to help the war effort, and support President Roosevelt. Earl Browder, at that time, thought that capitalists and labor could and should work together on a friendly basis. He felt Russia and the United States were allies, and doing very well as main allies in the war effort. He said, “I think American capitalism is very healthy and will continue to be healthy for a long time.” Therefore, labor and capitalists could work together very successfully for the benefit of all the people in the country, and this seemed to me to be the same kind of things President Roosevelt stood for, so I liked what they said—and so I affiliated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You may recall the Hollywood Democratic Committee was disbanded and succeeded by the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Do you recall that?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes; I recall that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed by the Hollywood Democratic Committee at the time that transformation took place?

Mrs. BURROWS. I don't think so. I don't remember when it took place, but I only worked for the Hollywood Democratic Committee up to the summer of 1944, and that was the end of my job, and I had no further connection with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you became a member of the Communist Party, or the Communist Political Association, were you assigned to a particular group or cell of the party?

Mrs. BURROWS. I attended meetings of the radio group. That was the name I knew it by.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. It was in connection with your membership in that group that Mr. Hauser, a witness for the committee, identified a person by the name of Carin Kinzel. I assume it was the same group Mr. Hauser was a member of with which you were affiliated.

Mrs. BURROWS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you participate in the meetings of that group?

Mrs. BURROWS. That was 1944, about the middle of it. I would say. I attended meetings of that group until April of 1945. At that time I had an emergency appendectomy and was hospitalized. There were complications, and I got a blood clot and was hospitalized for a long time. I went to a sanitarium and was on crutches and in a cast. During that time I was too ill to think of politics, and I had absolutely no contact at any time with the Communist Political Association or Communist Party. No one contacted me, and I was out of touch with everything. When I recovered—the best I can recall was toward the end of 1945 and the beginning of 1946—I think I began attending

meetings. This was a different group. The Communist Political Association was dissolved and it was back to calling itself the Communist Party, and they seemed to have taken a completely different policy or point of view than they had when I left. Earl Browder had been thrown out of the party, with much vilification and slander, and had been called a collaborationist and said to have led the American Party down a completely wrong path. There had been what was called the Duclos letter. Mr. Duclos was, I think, a bigwig in the French Communist Party and had apparently said the American Communists were not true Communists and soft.

MR. TAVENNER. Had become soft?

Mrs. BURROWS. He kept saying they were collaborationists because Mr. Browder was advocating getting along with capitalists. The whole atmosphere of the meetings was completely different then when I had been in it before. They talked about things like the class struggle and so on, and the whole atmosphere of the meetings was now one of intolerance and dictatorship. I don't know if a person ever could have disagreed with the party line before without having trouble, but it seemed to me to have changed completely from what it had been when I was in before. It seemed completely democratic to me at that time, possibly because no one disagreed. When I came back, I found myself very much in disagreement with them.

MR. TAVENNER. Was that disagreement expressed? Was that dispute that you mentioned between yourself and what appeared to be the sense of the meetings expressed at any of the meetings?

Mrs. BURROWS. By me?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, it was. I argued a good bit because I was very much shocked and surprised by what had gone on and suddenly I was told that everything that had been done before was all wrong and there would have to be a complete change. When I expressed doubt about this, I was told I didn't know anything about Marxism and I had better learn how to follow this new kind of thing. I objected very much to this attitude. It seemed to me, as I started to say before, I realized how undemocratic the setup of the party was because when you found yourself in disagreement, then you found there was no democracy at all. Nobody listened to you and you found yourself very much in the doghouse. I felt it had become a real dictatorship. The rank and file of people had nothing to say about making policy and deciding what had to be done. It also seemed, too, that the party was taking orders from abroad. Where Mr. Browder had always expressed the American heritage, it seemed to me all of a sudden they were taking orders from some other country.

MR. TAVENNER. Had you expressed any of those views at the meeting?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, I had.

MR. TAVENNER. How were those expressions received?

Mrs. BURROWS. They were not well received. I was told I was wrong and that I had been out of contact, and I needed to read things and bring myself up to date, and if I did study and listen to the people who knew more than I did, I would change my mind.

MR. TAVENNER. So frequently have we heard that the Communist Party has taken the position, when confronted with an abrupt change

in policy, that the people had formerly been unable to properly interpret the Marxist doctrines. If properly interpreted, the reasons for the change would be apparent.

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, that is what they said.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you met with that kind of argument?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, that is true. It was almost like fortunetelling. If you interpreted the cards correctly, it was fine, but you never did.

Mr. VELDE. How was the sentiment against the party divided at that time, would you say? How much of a percentage would be in favor of Browder's policies and how much of a percentage in favor of Jacques Duclos' policy?

Mrs. BURROWS. That would be hard for me to answer.

Mr. VELDE. In your own group, how much would you say?

Mrs. BURROWS. I only knew the radio group and it seemed to me at that time the majority of the group had accepted the new policy. I can say there were some who didn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been testimony that some withdrew as a result of the issue over the Duclos letter. This was the latter part of 1945, or the early part of 1946, when you returned to the party. My recollection is some had withdrawn about that time.

Mrs. BURROWS. That is true. One of the things which struck me at that time was, there were so many different people in the club. Many old faces had disappeared and many new ones that I hadn't seen before had appeared. While I was trying to get my bearings in this new situation and becoming more and more dissatisfied and disgusted with the meetings, an incident came up around that time which sort of crystallized my thinking. There was a man named Albert Maltz, whom I admired a great deal. You see, one of the greatest appeals the party had for artists and people in the show business was that being a good artist in itself was being a good citizen, and was contributing something of value to the country and to the community. Now a discussion arose in which, I believe, Mr. Maltz took the position that an artist should write and create the truth as he saw it and felt it, and that political knowledge was not necessary to know the truth or to state the truth. I think he gave examples of authors who had been actually reactionary, and still had been fine artists, and that was also true as I saw it. One of the examples which sticks in my mind was Balzac. He wrote of this in an article which I read, and I liked it very much. I respected Mr. Maltz very much. I didn't really know him personally, but had read some of his books and admired him greatly.

Mr. TAVENNER. In that article, did he take the position that art should not be used as a weapon?

Mrs. BURROWS. I think that was certainly the gist of what was said. I don't, of course, recall the exact words. I think I have said that I respected Mr. Maltz very much as an artist, and a creative man, and a man of dignity and stature in his world. After he wrote that article, he was severely reprimanded—I don't remember by whom—some bigwig in the Communist Party—and he was told that he was so wrong—that art is a weapon and that it must be used, and it must be slanted, and it is very important for the artist to incorporate in his work his political views. At any rate, I know they were very much against what Mr. Maltz had said. He was forced to, or allowed him-

self to be forced to publicly recant his position. I attended a large meeting in Hollywood in which Mr. Maltz got up and made a speech and said how wrong he had been, and blamed himself for having fallen into such a grave error, and said art was a weapon and had to be used as a weapon. He publicly disgraced and humiliated himself. It was a terrible spectacle to see a man I had always respected behave in this way. I decided that, with the constant changes taking place in the Communist Party, it was impossible to be a Communist and have freedom of thought and dignity as a human being. It was a dictatorship, and as such, was degrading to the people in it. I left the party after that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What would you place as the approximate time of your leaving the Communist Party?

Mrs. BURROWS. I would have to say it was in 1946. I can't say exactly. It was certainly not later than that, I am quite sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of your Communist Party experience and your knowledge that you acquired of the Communist Party activities while living in Hollywood, did you discern any efforts on the part of the Communist Party to influence its members in the expression of their art in such a way that it might be said that they were dictating how one should practice his art, or how one should think about matters of his art?

Mrs. BURROWS. Well, I didn't run into that myself in the radio group in Hollywood, other than having been an observer in the Albert Maltz case. I believe that was a rather widespread attitude among the writers in Hollywood. After that, and after having left the party, I have been very aware in later years of the attitude of the Soviet Union, for instance, to their artists. They have really, I think, destroyed fine artists and fine musicians. I think of the names of Shostakovich and Prokofieff. I know only of what I have read in the newspapers and what musical critics have mentioned, but I have felt Shostakovich and Prokofieff were both very much damaged, and their musical talent stifled and destroyed by the dictators in Russia saying about what they should write and what is good music, and that music should be to express political beliefs, and so forth. I would say, judging from what I have read in the papers, there is no question that Russia dictates completely to her artists and is destroying them rapidly. I know artists cannot grow in an atmosphere where there isn't complete freedom of thought.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of your own experience in the party, and your observations, are you of the opinion that the Communist Party does exert thought control on its members?

Mrs. BURROWS. Very definitely. Very definitely. I think that you are required to think exactly as the central power wants you to think.

Mr. VELDE. You mean as the hierarchy thinks?

Mrs. BURROWS. Hierarchy, or whoever it is, that makes the Communist policies in this country. I don't know who makes it, but those who dictate policy in the party are required to follow that line.

Mr. TAVENNER. If I understand your testimony correctly, it is precisely for that reason that you left the party?

Mrs. BURROWS. That is right. It is exactly right. I am very much against that kind of dictatorship, and when I was sure the Communist Party in this country really was a dictatorship, that was when I left.

Mr. VELDE. Again, when was that?

Mrs. BURROWS. That would be in 1946. I can't say exactly when.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any effort made at a later date to have you re-instated in the Communist Party?

Mrs. BURROWS. No; no one ever wanted me to become a member again because by the time I left they considered me a good riddance. Nobody wanted me back. I have made my beliefs very clear.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you and Abe Burrows married?

Mrs. BURROWS. October 2, 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you leave California? As I understand it, you now reside in New York?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, I do. It was 4 years ago, I think.

Mr. GANG. 1949.

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. Again I want to say that I don't want to ask you any questions at this time regarding your affiliation with the Communist Party in Seattle, as you have already told us in a general way about your experience there, but I would like you to tell the committee who played a part in having you reaffiliate with the Communist Party in 1944—I believe that was about the time you described—after you came to Hollywood.

Mrs. BURROWS. You mean who spoke to me about it specifically?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. BURROWS. I have been trying to recall, and I cannot be very definite about it. It could have been Henry Blankfort. I kept seeing the same people socially that I saw at the meetings, so it all sort of runs together in my mind. Henry Blankfort was the chairman of the radio group at that time, and I think it may have been him who contacted me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall how many persons were members of the group when you first affiliated with them?

Mrs. BURROWS. I would guess about 15 or 20. That was the usual makeup of a group.

Mr. TAVENNER. About how many composed the unit when you left the group?

Mrs. BURROWS. About the same. The attendance fluctuated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you able at this time to state definitely which persons were members of the first group, as distinguished from the group after your return to it?

Mrs. BURROWS. I couldn't say that definitely. I could for a few people I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am going to ask you if you can identify certain persons as members of that radio group, and in doing that—if you have any definite information as to whether or not the individual left the party at that time—I would like you to so state—and also identify the person as a member of the group before you left it in April of 1945—also if they were members of the group after you returned to the party in 1946. You have mentioned the name of Henry Blankfort. Was Sam Moore a member of that group?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes; Sam Moore attended meetings of the radio group. I would like to preface this for the record by saying that the people I recall are people who attended some meetings of the radio group—some very few, to my knowledge, and some came regularly.

Whether or not they were actual party members is beyond my knowledge, but I can tell you whether or not they attended our meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. By that you mean you are unable to say whether a card had been issued to them?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes; there were instances where people would come to a few meetings which I recall, and I assumed at the time these people were not actual members. For instance, I recall a girl who said she was a page for NBC and who came to one meeting and wrote down everyone's name who was there on a list. No one had ever heard of her, and she never came to another meeting. I remember several other occasions on which people came, and I thought they were new members, but they never came again. Either they were not members—or they left the party almost immediately. I have no way of knowing personally. That is the only point I am trying to make.

Mr. TAVENNER. In asking you these various questions, about these persons, I wish you would tell the committee whether or not their attendance was regular enough, and continuous enough, that you considered them members of your particular group—and also whether or not their participation in the meetings was of such character as to indicate to you they were members of the group the same as you. If I ask you the name of any person, and in your judgment that person didn't live up to these requirements, please so state. I asked you before about Sam Moore. So let me ask you the question again. Did Sam Moore attend the meetings with such regularity and participate in them in such a way as to indicate to you he was a member of the group?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, he did. Sam Moore was in the radio group, and attended the same meetings as I, up until the time I left.

Mr. TAVENNER. Georgia Backus?

Mrs. BURROWS. Georgia Backus was a member over the full period of time that I recall in Hollywood, and active in meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Hy Alexander?

Mrs. BURROWS. The same is true of Hy Alexander.

Mr. TAVENNER. Robin Short?

Mrs. BURROWS. Robin Short was in very briefly, at the beginning in Hollywood, and I don't know what happened to him after that. Whether he left the party, or entered another group, I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. But he did attend meetings of the group?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, he did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that is the first group?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Pauline Lauber?

Mrs. BURROWS. Pauline Lauber was attending meetings in the beginning, when I first went. She didn't remain very long, either, but she was active in the meetings while she was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not she was a functionary in the party?

Mrs. BURROWS. No; I don't. If she was a functionary in the party I don't remember it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dwight Hauser?

Mrs. BURROWS. Dwight Hauser was a member of the first radio group. He only attended a few of the meetings I attended. As I say,

he was attending regularly, but I believe he had dropped out some time before I went back in again.

Mr. TAVENNER. Paul McVey?

Mrs. BURROWS. The same is true of Paul McVey. I think he was in the early group, and I think he had dropped out when I went back in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Lynn Whitney?

Mrs. BURROWS. Lynn Whitney I cannot definitely place in either group. I know she attended some meetings. I don't know, however, if she was in the first or the last group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Hallie Jonas?

Mrs. BURROWS. Hallie Jonas was a member of the first group, and I believe she had dropped out by the time I went back in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Pauline Hopkins?

Mrs. BURROWS. Pauline Hopkins was one of the people I saw for the first time after my illness. I didn't see a great deal of her because I was not attending meetings regularly then and dropped out shortly after that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not she was the wife of Owen Vinson?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes; she was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Owen Vinson a member of the group?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes; he was at these meetings when I went back in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he was a treasurer of the group at the time you were a member?

Mrs. BURROWS. I don't remember that for sure myself. I understand he says he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Gene Stone?

Mrs. BURROWS. He was one of the new faces.

Mr. TAVENNER. Annette Harper?

Mrs. BURROWS. Annette Harper, like Lynn Whitney, I can't place definitely. It sort of fades out in my memory. I do know she attended some meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean you are unable to state in which group it was you saw her attend meetings.

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you definite in your recollection that she did attend meetings of the radio group?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes; she attended some of the meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sylvia Richards?

Mrs. BURROWS. She was in the group when I went back in, and attended very few meetings, to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Nina Klowden?

Mrs. BURROWS. Nina Klowden was a member of the new group. As I say, I didn't see any of the people much at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Angela Clarke?

Mrs. BURROWS. I don't remember Angela Clarke clearly, or which period I remember her from.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you are positive in your recollection that she attended meetings of the radio group?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Charles Glenn?

Mrs. BURROWS. Charles Glenn was a member of the new group when I came back in.



Mr. TAVENNER. Elaine Gonda?

Mrs. BURROWS. The same is true of Elaine Gonda.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mitchell Lindemann?

Mrs. BURROWS. She was a member of the new group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Reuben Ship?

Mrs. BURROWS. I think Reuben Ship was part of the new group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Billy Wolff?

Mrs. BURROWS. I can't place Billy Wolff exactly as to time. I think he was part of the new group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Leon Meadows?

Mrs. BURROWS. I think he was part of the new group, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall anything in particular with regard to his participation in Communist Party meetings?

Mrs. BURROWS. I have a rather personal recollection of Mr. Meadows. Mr. Meadows had been very unpleasant and even rather insulting to me when I expressed my differences of opinion with the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time—you are speaking now of the time you were disagreeing with the new line of the Communist Party after the ouster of Earl Browder?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, I believe that was the first time I ever saw him.

Mr. TAVENNER. That incident makes your memory clear in regard to Mr. Meadows?

Mrs. BURROWS. It was not just the main incident, but also his attitude that I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee what one person took the lead in the arguments ensuing from the receipt of the Duclos letter, while you were there?

Mrs. BURROWS. Well, that is a little hard to say. The group never had any real leadership of any kind, before or after, but as I say—I remember Leon Meadows talking and Mr. Lindemann had some kind of leadership in the group, and other than that I don't know. The discussions were general and everybody took part.

Mr. TAVENNER. You didn't affiliate with the Communist Party at any time after you left after 1946?

Mrs. BURROWS. No.

Mr. VELDE. And don't intend to, I presume?

Mrs. BURROWS. I'd like to never even think of it again!

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any other activity in this group—the radio group—of the Communist Party, which you can tell the committee about?

Mrs. BURROWS. No, I can't think of anything specifically. This radio group never engaged in any real political activity of any kind. It limited itself to discussions, and even the discussions were not terribly political in content. My recollection of the group is that 90 percent of the time we spent in talking about craft problems, AFRA problems, and the guild problems. In particular, during the period in which I was active—and that was largely a period of trying to elect President Roosevelt—there was a good deal of discussion, but the main thing we talked about was the campaign for President Roosevelt. When I came back, as I have stated, I didn't attend very long after that—my recollection of the meetings was that we were arguing a good bit of the time, and the people were trying to understand what the new policy was all about.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given Communist Party pamphlets or documents to read and study?

Mrs. BURROWS. There was always Communist literature at all the meetings spread out on the table, and the understanding was we were to read it, but it was never specifically given to anyone.

Mr. VELDE. Did your radio group do any work on behalf of the Free Browder movement?

Mrs. BURROWS. No; not that I know of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any position taken in your meetings of a nature to encourage the members of the group to become affiliated with what are termed Communist-front groups?

Mrs. BURROWS. Yes, I think so. I think that it was considered important to belong to as many organizations as possible, and to attempt to influence the policies and the workings of these organizations. They thought they were doing it for a good purpose. They thought they were right about everything, and that they should furnish leadership to everybody else.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall following that particular plan if you became a member of any Communist-front organization?

Mrs. BURROWS. No; I don't. I didn't join any organization. I didn't take part in any activities other than the Roosevelt campaign.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not functionaries of the Communist Party from a high level appeared from time to time before your group as lecturers?

Mrs. BURROWS. No; I don't recall anything of that kind. To my knowledge they didn't do that with our group. We were sort of step-children, I think. No one ever came near us.

Mr. VELDE. Let me say to Mrs. Burrows, for the record, that you have been a very intelligent and informative witness for the committee, and have added a great deal to the fund of information which is already in store in committee files. For your willingness to cooperate, and furnish that information, you are given the committee's thanks.

Mrs. BURROWS. May I say something for the record?

Mr. VELDE. You may.

Mrs. BURROWS. I would like to thank the committee, and say that I think the committee has been very fair, and very considerate, and I appreciate it.

Mr. VELDE. Thank you, Mrs. Burrows. If there are no more questions, the hearing is now adjourned.

(Whereupon this executive session was adjourned.)

# INDEX

## INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Alexander, Hy	1335
Backus, Georgia	1335
Bass, Charlotta	1293
Beck, George	1265
Belfrage, Cedric Henning	1271-1284 (testimony)
Belfrage, Mary Beatrice	1280
Bentley, Elizabeth	1280-1282, 1284, 1285
Berkeley, Martin	1267, 1306
Berman, Lionel	1322
Biddle, Attorney General Francis	1288
Blankfort, Henry	1334
Browder, Earl	1281, 1313, 1321, 1330, 1331, 1338
Blum, Leon	1288
Burrows, Abe	1334
Burrows, Mrs. Abe	1271
Burrows, Carin Kinzel (Mrs. Abe Burrows)	1327-1338 (testimony)
Cammer, Harold I.	1245-1259
Carlebach, Ameil	1287
Chodorov, Edward	1323
Chodorov, Jerome	1323
Claessens, August	1290
Clark, Attorney General Tom	1288-1290, 1293
Clarke, Angela	1336
Cohen, Robert	1235-1244 (testimony)
Cole, Lester	1265
Cooper, Gary	1305
Dambroff, Nathan	1272-1284
Darr, Rev. John	1297
Dondero, Representative	1275
DuBois	1293
Duclos, Jacques	1331
Dunne, John	1243
D'Usseau, Arnaud	1259, 1271, 1301-1315 (testimony)
D'Usseau, Susan	1306
Flacks, Davis	1244-1250 (testimony)
Flacks, Mrs. Mildred	1243, 1250-1253 (testimony)
Franse, Royal W.	1260, 1271, 1301-1315
Eisenstein	1310
Flynn, E. Gurley	1290
Ford, John	1306, 1311
Funn, Dorothy K.	1236, 1237, 1239, 1242, 1246, 1253, 1258, 1259
Gang, Martin	1327-1338
Gerst, Wilhelm Karl	1290
Glenn, Charles	1336
Goldwyn, Samuel	1275
Golos, Jacob	1285
Gonda, Elaine	1337
Gough, Lloyd	1322
Grastatares, Joseph A.	1243
Hallinan, Vincent	1293
Harper, Annette	1336
Hauser, Dwight	1335
Hopkins, Pauline	1336
Ickes, Harold	1288, 1314
Jacobs, Mrs. Florence H.	1257-1259 (testimony)
Jacobs, Julius G.	1253-1257 (testimony)

	Page
Janson, Dr. William	1243, 1251
Jerome, V. J.	1280, 1293
Johnson, Jack	1254
Jonas, Hallie	1336
Kinzel, Carin ( <i>see also</i> Carin Kinzel Burrows)	1328, 1329, 1330
Klowden, Nina	1336
Lauber, Pauline	1335
Lawson, John Howard	1265, 1291
Lee, Madeline	1323
Lehman, Senator	1250
Levy, Melvin	1265, 1267
Lindemann, Mitchell	1377
Maltz, Albert	1318, 1332, 1333
Marzani	1293
Matthews, J. B.	1295
McGregor, Marjorie	1329
McVey, Paul	1336
Meadows, Leon	1337
Medina, Judge	1292
Moore, Sam	1334, 1335
Nechemias, Anna	1243
Nichols, Dudley	1311
Oakden, George	1280
Oeko, Edna	1323
Offner, Mortimer	1260-1270 (testimony)
O'Flaherty, Lem	1311
Pepper, George	1329
Peters, J.	1243
Popper, Martin	1260-1270
Prokofieff	1333
Putzarath, Heinz	1290
Richards, Sylvia	1336
Robbins, Jerome	1315-1324 (testimony)
Roberts, Stanley	1305, 1307
Roosevelt	1314, 1329, 1330, 1337, 1338
Rosenberg, Ethel	1293
Rosenberg, Julius	1293
Salz, Morris	1243
Sacher, Harry	1292
Schein, George	1235-1244
Shaw, Arrie	1252
Ship, Reuben	1337
Short, Robin	1335
Shostakovitch	1333
Siegel, R. Lawrence	1315-1324
Silver, Max	1263
Silver, Rabbi	1309, 1310
Smith, Gerald L. K.	1313
Stever, Lettie	1322
Stone, Gene	1336
Sullivan, Elliott	1323
Townsend, Leo	1262, 1263, 1266
Trumbo, Dalton	1291
Vinson, Owen	1336
Whitney, Lynn	1336
Williams, Claude	1289
Wilson, Elizabeth	1265, 1266
Wolff, Billy	1337
Yasha	1280-1282

## ORGANIZATIONS

American Federation of Radio Artists	1337
American Legion	1304
American Women for Peace	1297
The Book of the Day Shop	1306
British Intelligence Service	1280, 1285

	Page
Brooklyn College.....	1257
California Labor School.....	1293
City College of New York.....	1236, 1245, 1250, 1253
Columbia University.....	1245, 1257, 1261, 1269
Commonwealth College, Mena, Ark.....	1289
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	1302, 1303
Franklin K. Lane High School.....	1257
Hollywood Democratic Committee.....	1329, 1330
Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.....	1330
Hunter College, New York.....	1257, 1328, 1329
Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.....	1294
Independent Progressive Party.....	1293
Jamaica Training School for Teachers.....	1250
Junior High School 227, Brooklyn.....	1236
Ku Klux Klan.....	1313
Lafayette High School, Brooklyn.....	1253
League of American Writers.....	1288
League of American Writers, Hollywood Chapter.....	1288
Little Theater, Seattle.....	1328
National Broadcasting Co.....	1335
National Committee for People's Rights.....	1288
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.....	1290-1292
National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.....	1290, 1293, 1294
National Lawyers Guild.....	1292
New York University.....	1236, 1257, 1315
Parent Teacher Association.....	1251
People's Institute of Applied Religion.....	1289
Public School 35, Brooklyn.....	1250, 1251
Public School 174, Brooklyn.....	1249
RKO.....	1329
Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace.....	1294
SIAEF.....	1286, 1293, 1297
Southern Resident Labor School, Mena, Ark.....	1289
State Department.....	1288, 1295
Supreme Court.....	1263
Teachers' Union.....	1246
United American Spanish Aid Committee.....	1289
University of Chicago.....	1261
University of Washington.....	1328, 1329
Washington Square College.....	1316
World Peace Appeal.....	1290
World Tourists.....	1280
Young Progressives of America.....	1290

## PUBLICATIONS

American Mercury.....	12, 5
Associated Press.....	1276
Black and White.....	1291, 1292
California Eagle.....	1293
Daily Worker.....	1258, 1288-1293, 1318
Daily People's World.....	1291, 1292
Frankfurter Rundschau.....	1287, 1290
Harpers Magazine.....	1287
International News Service.....	1276
London Daily and Sunday Express.....	1275
National Guardian.....	1275-1277, 1290, 1293-1295, 1299, 1301
New Leader.....	1290
New Masses.....	1280, 1288, 1318
New York Herald Tribune.....	1303
New York Times.....	1303
New York Teacher News.....	1246
The Protestant.....	1281
United Press.....	1276, 1305



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

3 9999 05018 395 1







